

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT CMRR SEIS
CMRR AT TECHNICAL AREA 55 (LOS ALAMOS)
Marriott Hotel
2101 Louisiana Boulevard, Northeast
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May 23, 2011
5:00 p.m.

REPORTED BY: Beverly Ann Schleimer, RDR NMCCR #66
Mary Abernathy Seal, RDR CRR NMCCR #69
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
201 Third Street, Northwest, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

JOB NO.: 1165K BEV/MARY

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 (5:30 p.m.)

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Good evening. My name is
3 Bruce MacAllister. Welcome. This is the first
4 public hearing for the Draft Supplemental
5 Environmental Impact Statement for the Los Alamos
6 National Laboratory Chemistry Metallurgy Research
7 Replacement building, the nuclear facility portion.
8 Pardon me, I've grown up in Colorado, and we often
9 say nuclear. So if I stumble, you'll know that I
10 know better.

11 My name is Bruce MacAllister. I'm the
12 senior principal at a firm called Business Excellence
13 Solutions. This firm and myself do community meeting
14 facilitations. We're all conflict resolution
15 specialists and organizational excellence
16 consultants. We work with a variety of
17 organizations, large and small, to resolve conflict,
18 and to help optimize efficiencies in those
19 organizations.

20 It's my pleasure to welcome you here
21 tonight. My role for the meeting tonight will be to
22 be your facilitator and moderator, insofar as I will
23 be conducting the flow of the meeting.

24 I'm going to go through carefully some
25 ground rules. And typically I work a little more

1 informally on the ground rules, but because we're
2 doing four officially recorded meetings, it's
3 important that the ground rules are consistent
4 meeting to meeting.

5 So I will work through these with you, so
6 that the understandings for tonight, the expectations
7 and understandings for tonight's meeting are clear to
8 you all.

9 And remember, if you care to speak at
10 tonight's meeting, at the mike for recording now,
11 please fill in a card at the registration table, and
12 we will be taking those comments in order once
13 received after we hear from any elected officials,
14 and I'll go through that in more detail in just a
15 minute.

16 The order of the meeting will be, I'll go
17 through the ground rules. We're going to have a
18 brief presentation by Mr. Tegtmeier, who's the public
19 document manager for the program. Then we will have
20 comments through the duration of the meeting.

21 The comments initially will be limited to
22 five minutes a person; however, if you feel like you
23 need to make another comment, if there's sufficient
24 time after we cycle through the first round of
25 comments, you are more than welcome to make another

1 comment.

2 Let me remind you that there are a variety
3 of options available to you for completing or
4 providing comments on the program. There are
5 computer stations in the back corner there. There's
6 a kiosk of facilities for taking your comments
7 electronically. You can fax comments. The fax
8 number will be available. There's a poster that
9 describes all of the different ways that you can make
10 your comments. And there's a second court reporter
11 back there for verbal comments.

12 So there's a multitude of ways that you can
13 get your comments in the official record, besides
14 speaking here at the mike.

15 We will be first asking for comments from
16 federal elected officials, followed by state, county,
17 municipal, and tribal governments, in that order.
18 And then we will be taking your comments based on the
19 order in which you registered.

20 Based on the number of participants here
21 tonight, it looks like we will be able to allot for
22 the initial round of comments five minutes per
23 comment. So I will be giving you a little bit of a
24 heads-up at about 30 seconds towards the end of your
25 comment, and then I'll ask you to yield the mike at

1 the conclusion of your five minutes, if you need the
2 full five minutes.

3 Again, I've mentioned the poster session.
4 Folks will continue to be available back there.

5 The focus of the hearing tonight is to
6 receive comments. That it's not to engage in debate
7 with one another. It is not to engage in debate with
8 subject matter experts. We are here to answer
9 technical questions, not to justify national policy
10 or to defend decisions that are made at higher levels
11 in the nation, either by Congress or by senior
12 administration officials.

13 So, I would ask you, if at all possible, to
14 keep your comments focused. You are certainly free
15 to make any comments you wish, but the comments that
16 are most useful for us tonight will be focused on the
17 Environmental Impact Statement for the facility, as I
18 mentioned.

19 Any discussions that go on in the back of
20 the room with the subject matter experts are not a
21 matter of the official record. The official record
22 will either involve the comments that were received
23 at the kiosk, or they are comments that were received
24 at the mike.

25 If we run out of time tonight, for any

1 reason, there are three other meetings scheduled.
2 There is a handout in the poster area that describes
3 the meeting locations, one in Espanola, one in
4 Santa Fe, and one in Los Alamos.

5 And the comment session -- the comment
6 period for this Supplemental Environmental Impact
7 Statement runs through June 28th. So, there is ample
8 time to make those comments.

9 As far as actually conducting our conduct
10 in the meeting tonight, a couple of ground rules,
11 please wait until I invite you to the mike. I will
12 be inviting one person and letting another person
13 know that they're next, so that they can be prepared
14 to come up, so we have minimal lag time between the
15 comments.

16 And because we're transcribing these
17 comments, it's very important that the audience
18 remain civil and quiet, so that we can get the
19 comment recorded. One comment at a time without
20 interruption, please. Please identify yourself
21 before speaking. Please abide by the time limits.
22 If we start getting close to your time, I will ask
23 you to yield the mike, and if we have time, I will --
24 we will make accommodation for you to make a second
25 statement.

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 And as a final reminder, please, let's
2 remember that this is a public hearing, that what
3 we're here to do is model civil dialogue. We're here
4 to model interpersonal civility and mutual respect.
5 And in that vein, let's keep our language appropriate
6 for a publicly-recorded meeting.

7 And, finally, let's make sure that our cell
8 phones and anything else that might make intrusive
9 noise while others are commenting are silenced.

10 And without further ado, I'd like to
11 introduce the document manager for the project, John
12 Tegtmeier.

13 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: Good evening. Welcome
14 everyone, and I appreciate everyone's attendance.
15 This is very important to us, these public hearings,
16 and the entire process for receiving comments on the
17 draft document, important role.

18 In one of the -- the two areas that is my
19 prime responsibility as document manager; number one,
20 is to manage the preparation of the document, and
21 meet all of NEPA requirements and procedural
22 requirements required by law. But I believe my most
23 important is to encourage and facilitate public
24 interaction in the process. And for that, I really
25 appreciate everyone coming this evening. And I take

1 that second role very seriously in fulfilling my
2 duties.

3 I wanted to give just a very brief
4 background of the NEPA history, the National
5 Environmental Policy Act history on this project, and
6 then talk a little bit about what you might see in
7 the document, and then lead you to the end of the
8 comment period.

9 Back in 2003, we did an Environmental
10 Impact Statement for this facility, the CMRR
11 facility. That was issued in November of 2003.

12 In early 2004, the NNSA issued a record of
13 decision that decided upon, based on the
14 environmental assessment, environmental analysis of
15 the various alternatives, they selected a preferred
16 alternative, which is a two-building concept at
17 TA-55, and that's adjacent to the current facility.

18 So the first building is actually
19 completed. There's some information on the posters
20 back there. That's the radiological laboratory
21 facility office building, that's being outfitted
22 right now. So these people will be moving into the
23 facility very shortly. And the second building is
24 currently in design.

25 And Bruce mentioned to us the nuclear

1 facility portions. That will be the second building.

2 Since the time that we prepared the
3 Environmental Impact Statement and the Department
4 issued the record decision, we did some additional
5 geological mapping at the site, and there's some
6 photographs on the poster down there, at the poster
7 sessions, where they basically looked at fracture
8 mapping in the exposed face of the tuff there at the
9 side.

10 They also did bore hole drilling, and they
11 determined the presence of a layer that's at some
12 depth beneath the proposed facility location.

13 In addition to that, they did an update to
14 the seismic study of the conditions at Los Alamos
15 National Laboratory, specific in there to TA55 where
16 the plutonium facility's located, and Technical Area
17 3, the main technical area of the laboratory. And
18 that resulted in an increase in the horizontal ground
19 motions and vertical ground motions associated with
20 earthquakes at various return periods.

21 So, that was new information available to
22 the designers and to the Department, and as part of
23 the NEPA process is to periodically review new
24 information that's available. And based on that, the
25 Laboratory prepared a supplement analysis and

1 submitted that to our office, at Los Alamos Site
2 Office in the middle of the summer.

3 And, in part, based on that, the NNSA
4 decided to go ahead and prepare a Supplemental
5 Environmental Impact Statement for the project. And
6 that decision was made, like I said, in the late
7 summer.

8 So we set up a series of scoping meetings.
9 We had two scoping meetings; one in Los Alamos, one
10 in Pojoaque, in early October of last year.

11 The Notice of Intent to prepare the
12 Supplemental EIS was issued in the Federal Register
13 on October 1st. So, the comment period extended
14 through the middle of November. We got some very
15 good scoping input.

16 So, the document that is before us now, the
17 Draft Supplemental EIS, is a culmination of the work
18 since essentially October 1, and that's reflected in
19 the document.

20 Now, as part of the analysis -- we had to
21 look at some new analyses. There's some new
22 requirements to look at various things, like
23 greenhouse gas emissions from various operations,
24 both construction and operations of the facilities.
25 And we also had to do an intentional destructive act

1 analysis, potential consequences of a terrorist
2 attack, or something of that nature.

3 And also wanted to do a specific
4 transportation analysis of the demolition waste from
5 the existing chemistry-metallurgy replacement, I
6 mean, CMR research Building at Los Alamos.

7 And we also updated analyses in areas of --
8 obviously, the construction impacts, because to meet
9 the new requirements for seismic and geological
10 features at the site, we had to beef up the
11 structural strength, and do some other nuclear safety
12 type enhancements to the design.

13 We've also updated the operations impacts,
14 not only for the proposed project, but since we're
15 going to be in the CMR Building for a longer period
16 of time, we also updated the environmental impacts of
17 operations of that facility, as well as the RLUOB
18 facility, which is complete, and will be in operation
19 shortly.

20 We also updated the accident analyses for
21 both the existing CMR Building and the new proposed
22 facility.

23 And we also updated the human health
24 impacts due to operations.

25 There were some changes in the way the

1 modeling is done. And we also incorporated the stuff
2 we could, the latest census data. That isn't all in
3 yet, but we took the information most current at the
4 time.

5 Now, the alternatives that we have
6 currently in the draft EIS is to construct and
7 operate the nuclear facility portion as we selected
8 2004 record of discussion.

9 So, that's in our no-action alternative, in
10 the context of we would not change past decisions
11 made in NEPA. So that's why it's the no-action
12 alternative.

13 We also looked at the modified CMRR Nuclear
14 Facility alternative. And that was originally
15 started with just one construction option, and that
16 was the deep excavation option, which would involve
17 going down into that layer of volcanic tuff that was
18 not structurally as strong as we believed it needed
19 to be. But in the course of looking into that
20 further, we also identified a shallow excavation
21 option. It would be the same facility located on the
22 same footprint, but raised higher up in the geologic
23 strata, so as to not require the digging out and
24 refilling that additional excavation with clean
25 concrete.

1 Then the last alternative is the continued
2 use of the CMR Building alternative, which is
3 basically a no construction option alternative. And
4 we would continue to perform the limited capabilities
5 in the existing building for as long as we could
6 without major upgrades.

7 So those are all action alternatives and
8 the no-action alternative.

9 We posted the Draft Supplemental EIS on our
10 NNSA web page on April 22nd of this year. And that
11 was followed a week later by the EPA publishing and
12 giving a Notice of Availability of the draft document
13 to give public comment on April 29.

14 And at that time, the comment period was a
15 45-day comment period. And subsequent to, that based
16 on some requests, the NNSA decided to extend that
17 comment period by 15 days, and that decision was made
18 on May 6th, and that information was posted and
19 distributed to various media, and now the public
20 comment period that Bruce mentioned, up to June 28th.
21 So I encourage all of the individuals who wish to
22 comment, to participate in the process and prepare
23 these comments by that time frame.

24 Bruce mentioned the other meetings that we
25 will have following tonight's public hearing.

1 Although more to come on that, we will have a meeting
2 at Los Alamos tomorrow evening at the Holiday Inn
3 Express. As you're coming into town, you follow the
4 drive right off the main hill road -- off the main
5 hill road.

6 We will have a public hearing in Espanola
7 on Wednesday the 25th at the Santa Claran Hotel in
8 Espanola. And on Friday -- Thursday, I mean, we will
9 have the public hearing in Santa Fe at the community
10 college there south of town. And it will be the same
11 format, and we will have the same time. We'll start
12 at 4:45 with the doors open, poster session 5:00 to
13 5:30, and then we'll start comments at 5:35, and run
14 through 9:00 p.m., at that time.

15 And as Bruce mentioned, also, we have
16 various ways to present -- provide comments on the
17 draft documents. So I encourage any number of those
18 ways. Feel free to comment multiple times. We will
19 be taking comments through June 28th.

20 So I appreciate you-all being here, and I'd
21 like to get started with the main part of our
22 process, and ask Bruce to get started, and we'll
23 start taking your public comments.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MR. MacALLISTER: A couple of late-breaking

1 announcements, folks. Based on the number of people
2 that ultimately have signed up to make comments, we
3 have -- we're required to reduce our initial round to
4 comment, the time frame for that, to three minutes.

5 So, we will go through these as quickly as
6 we can, and hopefully we'll have time for additional
7 comments after that.

8 So, I'll try to be as efficient as I can
9 with that.

10 Also, I've been asked to let people know
11 that the video that's being made in the center of the
12 room right now is not being done by the Department of
13 Energy or the National Nuclear Safety Administration.

14 So, if anybody objects to having their
15 image videoed while they're making their comment,
16 kindly just bring that up with the videographer, and
17 we will work that out.

18 Without further ado, I'm going to take the
19 names in the order that I've been given them, based
20 on your registration. And I'm going to call out two
21 names; the first name will be our first speaker, the
22 second name is the person to be ready to speak next.

23 First we have Ray M. Baca. And Scott Kovac
24 will be in the chute to be speaking next.

25 And Mr. Baca, you can use this mike or that

1 mike. You ready?

2 MR. RAY M. BACA: Good evening. My name is
3 Ray Baca. I am the Executive Director for the
4 New Mexico Building Trades Council.

5 In that capacity, I represent all of the
6 construction labor unions here in the state of
7 New Mexico. This includes approximately 800
8 construction and maintenance workers that are
9 currently employed there at the Laboratory. These
10 are family-sustaining well-paying jobs that
11 unfortunately otherwise would not be available
12 anywhere else in northern New Mexico. They are very
13 few and far between.

14 For those of you who are not aware, the
15 construction industry in New Mexico is in a very
16 blighted state currently, as it is in most of the
17 country. The unemployment rate for construction
18 workers has fully doubled, and in many cases triple
19 that of the average unemployed New Mexican.

20 It is not uncommon to see unemployment
21 rates of 25 to 28 percent in many of the crafts that
22 we represent.

23 Obviously, if this facility comes to be, if
24 and when it comes to be, this should be a tremendous
25 boost not only to the construction industry of

1 New Mexico, but more importantly to the many
2 construction families in New Mexico who are in dire
3 straits.

4 We respectfully urge the Lab to begin this
5 project sooner than later. Thank you.

6 MR. MacALLISTER: Mr. Kovac, followed by
7 Robert Press.

8 MR. SCOTT KOVAC: Thank you. My name is
9 Scott Kovac with Nuclear Watch of New Mexico in
10 Santa Fe.

11 First off, I would -- I'm having a problem
12 with this format tonight. I would prefer to see a
13 presentation given along with your explanation. Very
14 complicated issue. You have the posters. Those
15 could be a PowerPoint presentation. Yes, the subject
16 matter experts, it would be nice to get them on
17 record.

18 Thank you. (Applause.)

19 Okay. On to my comments. I will -- first
20 off, I request that this EIS -- this Supplemental EIS
21 be withdrawn, and that true alternatives are
22 analyzed.

23 The alternatives we're given, two out of
24 the three are not really alternatives. To build the
25 existing -- I mean, alternative number one, the

1 no-action alternative is to, you know, build the
2 2003-2004 version of the nuclear facility, which at
3 this stage cannot be done, because of the seismic
4 issues. So, that's not really an alternative.

5 The other alternative is to continue using
6 the existing -- you know, the existing CMR facility
7 without upgrading it. And that's not really an
8 alternative, either.

9 So you've eliminated two alternatives, and
10 you're down to one alternative and, you know, we're
11 not here tonight to just decide if it's a deep
12 facility or shallow facility.

13 I also think we should analyze the -- take
14 a hard look at the costs of the facility. A lot of
15 the issues -- a lot of the previous decisions were
16 based on costs back in 2003-2004, before the seismic
17 issues were known -- the increased seismic issues
18 were known.

19 It was -- at that point it was decided that
20 it would be cheaper to build a new building than to
21 upgrade the existing old building, and I'm not sure
22 that's true any more. Upgrading the existing CMR
23 building was an option in the scoping comments, and
24 for some reason it got removed, and we would like to
25 see that back as an alternative.

1 Thank you. And I will submit formal
2 comments also. Thank you. (Applause.)

3 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. Robert Press
4 followed by Don Hancock.

5 MR. PRESS: I will be brief. Recently the
6 United States and Russia agreed to reduce the number
7 of nuclear warheads. And here we are with a proposal
8 from the Department of Energy and LANL suggesting
9 that we build a new building, build new pits for
10 nuclear weapons. Does the word hypocrisy mean
11 anything to you? It does to me.

12 What I thought about doing when I came here
13 was to set up an employment agency outside, because
14 it seems to me when we come to these hearings the
15 question is about jobs. Never mind that the jobs are
16 a threat to the citizens of the United States. Never
17 mind that the Department of Energy is supposed to be
18 a protective agency for the people of the United
19 States. But when we want to build something new and
20 create more jobs, as the gentleman earlier said, then
21 we vote for building more bombs.

22 Japan just went through a serious problem.
23 Three Mile Island was a serious problem. Russia had
24 its own serious problem. But do we pay attention to
25 any of those? No. We do not live in a democracy any

1 more. We are controlled by corporate America, and
2 the people who work at these agencies are employed by
3 corporate America. If they want other jobs, I would
4 be happy to help them find jobs. We need other
5 scientists to look for peaceful ways of bringing
6 safety to the United States and the rest of the
7 world. But we ignore that.

8 I have been to many of these hearings. And
9 at most hearings, the majority of the people who are
10 giving evidence, are not listened to. And I am sure
11 tonight that what I have said will not be listened
12 to.

13 So, I am not going to waste my time. And I
14 hope other people will join me as I walk out.

15 Thank you. (Applause.)

16 MR. MacALLISTER: Don Hancock, followed by
17 Dave McCoy.

18 MR. DON HANCOCK: Good evening. I'm Don
19 Hancock from Southwest Research and Information
20 Center, a 40-year-old organization based in
21 Albuquerque.

22 We've looked at dozens of Environmental
23 Impact Statements over the last 40 years, and this
24 one is one of the worst, most obviously illegal ones
25 that we have ever looked at, and I've seen some

1 pretty bad documents.

2 One of the things that's interesting,
3 though, is that this document that was referred to,
4 this is the 2003 Environmental Impact Statement on
5 this project, the preferred alternative in this
6 document and, in fact, the option that was chosen in
7 the Department of Energy Record of Decision, is now
8 rejected as being inadequate, inappropriate, because
9 it doesn't meet the seismic hazard problems.

10 Well, that's pretty amazing, the Department
11 of Energy itself has said, this Environmental Impact
12 Statement that it did is legally inadequate.

13 When you have a legally inadequate
14 document, what should you do? The Department of
15 Energy has two reasonable choices.

16 One, the preferred one, would be to say,
17 well, we guess we shouldn't build this nuclear
18 facility at all. That would be what the preferred
19 alternative would be.

20 The other alternative would be to go back
21 and start over with a legally adequate Environmental
22 Impact Statement. They've chosen not to do that,
23 either, but to take an illegal, inadequate document,
24 and say, we can supplement it. With what? With a
25 one-alternative proposal. The one alternative is to

1 build a shiny, new nuclear bomb plant, and dig a
2 58-foot hole to put the shiny bomb plant on top.

3 Or the other alternative is to dig a
4 130-foot hole in the ground, fill half of it up with
5 cement, and put the shiny bomb plant on top of it.

6 Those are not what are called all of the
7 reasonable alternatives. The Council on
8 Environmental Quality Regulations that govern these
9 procedures say that the heart -- their word, the
10 heart of an Environmental Impact Statement is
11 discussion of all reasonable alternatives.

12 So this new document has no heart. It has
13 no heart from a legal standpoint, and it has no heart
14 from a lot of other standpoints.

15 What about the other reasonable
16 alternatives? The alternative of not building it?
17 No, that -- can't consider that, because that
18 wouldn't fulfill our purpose and mission.

19 What about the alternative of using the
20 existing plutonium facility? That's rejected in one
21 sentence, quote, "It would interfere with performing
22 work currently being conducted there, and reduce the
23 space available in the building that could be used to
24 conduct future DOE and NNSA mission support work."

25 That's not -- that one sentence is not what

1 you call a rigorous analysis of all of the
2 alternatives. So they haven't done that.

3 There are other alternatives that I could
4 go into, and actually Mr. Snyder encouraged me before
5 the hearing started tonight, to go into detail about
6 the other reasonable alternatives that should be
7 included, but I've now been told that I only have
8 three minutes, so that clearly, we are getting mixed
9 messages here. On the one hand we want to hear what
10 the analysis of the reasonable alternatives should
11 be. And on the other hand we're told, oh, by the
12 way, you really don't have time to do that.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Well, actually, your time
14 is up.

15 MR. DON HANCOCK: Well, I understand, but
16 there's another thing that needs to be said about how
17 DOE can't be bothered with talking about the
18 reasonable alternatives. DOE's own regulations say
19 that they have to notice 15 days in advance.

20 MR. MacALLISTER: Sir, your time is up, I'm
21 going to have to ask you to give up the mike.

22 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Let him speak, let
23 him speak.

24 (Speakers from the Floor were talking at
25 the same time, and could not be reported.)

1 MR. DON HANCOCK: This is a good example --
2 this is a good example of the Department of Energy
3 not wanting to hear people's comments.

4 MR. MacALLISTER: My apologies. We set out
5 the ground rules. I've asked you to abide by the
6 ground rules.

7 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: You set them up.
8 We didn't set them up.

9 (Speakers from the floor were talking at
10 the same time, and could not be reported.)

11 MR. MacALLISTER: We have many other people
12 waiting, and the intention is to let everybody speak.

13 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: (Speaking at the
14 same time as Mr. MacAllister.) (Inaudible.) Willing
15 to give up for that?

16 OTHER SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR: I am.
17 I will give him my time.

18 MR. MacALLISTER: If somebody -- if the
19 next person I call chooses to yield, that will be --
20 I will give him another three minutes, that's fine,
21 but Dave McCoy is in the cue.

22 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: No, everybody
23 should take their own time.

24 MR. MacALLISTER: And Dennis Holloway is
25 next.

1 MR. DAVE McCOY: I agree with Mr. Hancock.
2 My name is David McCoy. I am the Director for
3 Citizen Action. I agree with Mr. Hancock about the
4 phantom alternatives that are being presented here.

5 Additionally, the use of National Security
6 protocol is being used to trump the NEPA. This is a
7 very inadequate SEIS.

8 The only reason it was issued at the time
9 it was issued is because there was a lawsuit against
10 the lack of a new EIS being in effect.

11 The SEIS fails to examine reasonable
12 alternatives to the proposed CMRR.

13 The preferred alternative of building is
14 not technically or financially feasible through the
15 completely unsafe geological location that's been
16 chosen.

17 Moving or not constructing at all must be
18 an alternative for consideration.

19 The uncertainties associated with building
20 either the shallow or the deep excavations of the
21 CMRR, as proposed in the SEIS, are insurmountable.

22 Let's take a look at some of the
23 information that's missing about this site
24 geologically.

25 There's no determination of a kappa from a

1 network of seismometers.

2 An analysis of high potential ground
3 shaking due to amplification of seismic waves by the
4 near surface soils or at the near surface soils,
5 which is commonly referred to as site amplification,
6 is completely missing. Mapping of faults beneath
7 LANL, and the relationship to regional tectonics is
8 missing.

9 Information that should warn against the
10 use of this site is that the potential for
11 compression of the weak, soft volcanic ash beneath
12 the heavy CMRR, and the potential subsidence over the
13 long-term, the so-called raft that is supposed to
14 float, may sink.

15 The potential is there for hydro collapse
16 due to wetting. The added weight to the CMRR from
17 the use of water, supplying this water within the
18 building for fire suppression, and for cooling
19 plutonium, has not been presented.

20 The slope instability, which can cause
21 excessive movement is not really being considered.

22 The increased seismic shaking due to the
23 soft volcanic ash and building response is not really
24 set forward.

25 We can't do an adequate risk analysis,

1 because they don't have the data in place to do a
2 risk analysis, and yet they're trying to tell the
3 public that this is safe. The accident that can
4 happen there, is supposedly a spill of plutonium.

5 Listen, the accident that can happen is an
6 explosion or a fire out there with plutonium, and the
7 loss of Colorado and most of Santa Fe, and most of
8 New Mexico. Let's quit kidding ourselves. This --

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Your time is up.

10 MR. McCOY: Yeah, I know.

11 This EIS talks about -- well, we are going
12 to incorporate the lessons of Fukushima. The lesson
13 of Fukushima is don't build nuclear reactors and
14 nuclear facilities in unsafe geological locations.

15 MR. MacALLISTER: Dennis Holloway, followed
16 by Joan Brown.

17 MR. DENNIS HOLLOWAY: I'm an architect in
18 the state of New Mexico. I was licensed as an
19 architect in 1970, and this is ridiculous. What's
20 going to happen to this state if this plant goes in?
21 I can tell you that all architects have to take
22 earthquake exams to be licensed in certain states
23 like California. New Mexico doesn't require that,
24 even though we have so many earthquakes.

25 But just to let you know, I have studied it

1 carefully. It's part of my training. And I'm here
2 to tell you that this EIS, all the statements about
3 seismic issues -- baloney. And don't trust it. We
4 need to get an expert analysis of that seismic site
5 before any more nuclear facilities are built in that
6 death factory. (Applause.)

7 MR. MacALLISTER: Joan Brown, followed by
8 Marlene Perrotte.

9 SISTER JOAN BROWN: Good evening, my name
10 is Joan Brown. I'm a Franciscan sister and I work in
11 several different ecology and faith organizations
12 throughout the state. I have been to numerous of
13 these hearings. I keep coming, and nothing seems to
14 change. There's no real alternative, and I second
15 the voice that our voices are not heard. I'm not a
16 technical expert, but I am a citizen, and I work in
17 these issues all the time. I am appalled that we are
18 continuing to go forth with this without a realistic
19 EIS. I'm appalled that we are spending \$4.5 million
20 on such a facility when we have a \$14 trillion debt
21 in this nation, when we are cutting education funds,
22 we are cutting health care funds, we don't have any
23 money for true energy alternatives like solar, wind,
24 and others that we haven't even thought of. I'm
25 appalled we would even stand to continue to put up

1 with this.

2 I think a better alternative for the
3 investigation of this would be to call some of these
4 very intelligent credible citizen experts and sit
5 down and talk with them instead of whoever the,
6 quote, experts are that have been being relied upon.

7 But ultimately, this is a deep moral and
8 spiritual issue. And I believe that we have lost and
9 are losing our soul in this nation bit by bit, more
10 and more. That we would build such a facility on a
11 vulnerable piece of land seismically that would
12 threaten our water in the state, which we already are
13 in a drought and we are in severe concerns about,
14 shows that we have no care, concern, for the current
15 populations, the people, or the future children and
16 people of not only this nation, but of other
17 countries, as well.

18 We are risking all of this and all of this
19 money, and yet we fail to consider climate change,
20 which is affecting millions, billions, of people on
21 this planet. It's truly a waste of money.

22 I do, in closing, have an alternative that
23 I would like to propose. And I propose this even
24 though some of you might think it's very simplistic,
25 and there's not enough time to explain it in great

1 depth, but my alternative is on the other side of
2 what really is propelling this particular project,
3 and that's the \$14.5 billion of these dollar bills,
4 but on the other side it says, "In God we trust." I
5 would propose that an alternative be not in a
6 simplistic manner but in a truly deep, spiritual,
7 moral and ethical way to look at what does it mean to
8 really trust in God and our own creative
9 possibilities, intelligence, as individuals and as
10 collective people in this state, and propose other
11 alternatives. In God we trust. And I'm giving this
12 as my alternative for documentation.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. Marlene,
14 followed by Camy Condon.

15 MS. MARLENE PERROTTE: We have been asked
16 to model civil dialogue, which means be submissive to
17 the military, to the corporate/military/industrial
18 complex. The greatest threat that we have, says the
19 Pentagon, is climate change. Nuclear weapons are
20 obsolete. How do we confront DOE and DOD with the
21 mixture of the corporate/military money? What
22 happened to governing power by the people, of the
23 people, and for the people? It seems also that this
24 process is obsolete.

25 We must understand that when we make

1 decisions that are going to affect millions and the
2 future of our planet, when we're talking about
3 uncertainty and we have no data on the risk, we must
4 understand we need to use the precautionary
5 principle. We must find out and we must ask, "Prove
6 to me that the Clean Water Act will not be violated.
7 Prove to me that the Clean Air Act will not be
8 violated. Prove to me that nuclear weapons should be
9 on that seismic mountain. Prove to me all the things
10 that you are saying, that this is not going to
11 happen."

12 I think we must understand that we have
13 been entrusted with the sovereign resources of this
14 world. Are we going to put our trust in this
15 bombplex when our budget is being balanced on the
16 backs of teachers, Medicare and Medicaid people and
17 people that are senior citizens in Social Security?
18 Isn't that something, to come to a point when we
19 prefer putting our trust in nuclear weapons rather
20 than the humanity of this planet and the earth
21 community. Thank you. (Applause.)

22 MR. MacALLISTER: Camy Condon, followed by
23 Bastia Miller.

24 MS. CAMY CONDON: Good afternoon. My name
25 is Camy Condon, a long-time resident of New Mexico,

1 and a lover of every part of nature here. I also
2 work a little bit in Japan, where I have published 15
3 books, was a journalist, and I'm doing volunteer work
4 with micro credit banking in northeastern Brazil
5 because I'm on Social Security and I can volunteer in
6 another place.

7 But I'm right now here to be strongly
8 against this project. I will only say one reason. I
9 agree with many other points that have been made, but
10 I want to say only one comment about the seismic
11 hazards. Right now I have my son, Michael, and my
12 granddaughter, and the mom of the family living in
13 Tokyo. My son works there as a manager for a
14 Japanese company, one of the largest, most profitable
15 telephone companies in Tokyo, Japan, and my
16 granddaughter, age 1, is now receiving low-level
17 radiation from the Fukushima plant. I speak Japanese
18 and ever since the tsunami, the earthquake, and the
19 tsunami, I been watching online all of the daily
20 reports from the NHK Broadcasting, Japanese
21 corporation reports from the beginning until now. I
22 am horrified to think that my granddaughter might
23 come back to my house in New Mexico, escaping
24 radiation in Japan, and find radiation hazards here
25 in New Mexico, more of them, even more.

1 I know very little about the geology of the
2 Pajarito Plateau, except I do know that there are
3 faults there and that the current building is above
4 one of the faults, and that is a new building,
5 according to the gentleman who informed me earlier,
6 down the road, the plans for that down the road from
7 this seismic fault. I don't think that's down the
8 road far enough, and because of the unsafe location,
9 the reality that we will hopefully not ever need any
10 of these weapons, I don't want my own tax money used
11 for this purpose. I strongly object to this project,
12 and thank you for letting us testify.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. Bastia
14 Miller, followed by Marcus Page.

15 MS. BASTIA MILLER: My name is Bastia
16 Miller. I'm on the board of Concerned Citizens for
17 Nuclear Safety in Santa Fe. I want to start by
18 saying how disconcerting it is to have our time for
19 speaking abruptly changed from five minutes to three
20 minutes. Some speakers are excellent extemporaneous
21 speakers, and I have my things written down, and so
22 it has really inhibited my ability to present in a
23 reasonable way, to go back through and figure out how
24 to make three minutes out of my five minutes, and I
25 think that that kind of abrupt shift in the ground

1 rules discourages the public from coming forward.

2 I want to register my observation that the
3 proposed CMRR building has a limited rationale in the
4 sense that it does not seem to have been adapted to
5 the changing circumstances of our world. First I'm
6 thinking of climate change, which means we can no
7 longer trust our risk measurements. The land is
8 responding with earthquakes. The water is responding
9 with tsunamis. The weather is going to extremes of
10 hot and cold, and tornadoes bring destruction. It's
11 hard to gain a footing under those circumstances.

12 There are other critical reasons for taking
13 a true look at possible alternatives to the proposed
14 CMRR, but the nuclear industry seems to be intent on
15 building itself up without reviewing the big picture.
16 One way is that our human institutions are flawed.
17 The profit motive has come to play a bigger and
18 bigger role in determining our goals. We move away
19 from science at its best when government institutions
20 are privatized.

21 Another flaw is that regulators are unable
22 consistently to hold themselves to the standards that
23 are separate, in terms of public interest, from the
24 people who are being regulated.

25 I have to move along, because I have this

1 sense of impending abrupt termination.

2 The next point concerns nuclear waste.
3 Los Alamos has a long history of carelessness in
4 handling nuclear waste, promises for cleanup that are
5 not carried out, and of priorities that put cleanup
6 in the last place. With the recent settlement under
7 the Clean Water Act, they have another opportunity to
8 show good faith, and for that I would like to be
9 grateful, but rationally, I still hold a wait-and-see
10 attitude. I grew up in Missouri, the "Show Me"
11 state.

12 My last point has to do with the economy of
13 the surrounding communities. These communities have
14 borne heavy consequences --

15 MR. MacALLISTER: Thirty seconds. You're
16 fine.

17 MS. BASTIA MILLER: -- for being in the
18 neighborhood of Los Alamos. The health effects for
19 people who have worked at the lab are severe. People
20 have suffered the consequences of contamination
21 because of Cerro Grande fire. The traditional ways
22 of life are being curtailed and eliminated.

23 I want to conclude with this quotation from
24 Octavio Paz. He says, "The idea of a single
25 civilization for everyone implicit in the cult of

1 progress and technique impoverishes and mutilates us.
2 Every view of the world that becomes extinct, every
3 culture that disappears diminishes a possibility of
4 life."

5 These are just some of the concerns I have.
6 I'd like to encourage the Department of Energy to
7 take a deeper look, a step back from simply
8 continuing to do more of the same. Thank you very
9 much.

10 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you. Marcus Page,
11 followed by Benjamin Abbott.

12 MR. MARCUS PAGE: Moo. I am the cash cow.
13 I am so happy to receive all this money in
14 foolishness. But I'm not the cash cow, I was just
15 dressed as the cash cow. My name is Marcus, with
16 Trinity Nuclear Abolitionists, and I'm opposed to the
17 system of feeding the cash cow because the nuclear
18 complex was not meant to be a jobs program for
19 scientists and for the working class folks that build
20 the factories. And that's what it has become, and
21 I'm sorry about that, because I do agree with all the
22 antinuclear and nuclear abolitionist statements that
23 have been made before me tonight, so I don't want to
24 repeat it. I just want to echo it. I wish you could
25 play it back on a tape so you could hear it.

1 Thank you all for what you have said
2 tonight, especially Sister Joan Brown on the
3 spiritual level. So I'm inviting all of you to come
4 pray with Trinity Nuclear Abolitionists on Father's
5 Day, which is also Holy Trinity Sunday. It's June
6 19th, and then Monday morning, June 20th. Thanks
7 again for all the antinuclear and nuclear abolition
8 statements. They are true. And thanks for the
9 technical statements from our watchdog groups.

10 Back to cash cow mode. Feed me more money
11 to destroy the planet. Moo. I am a fool. I am
12 Los Alamos. I am the Department of Energy.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. MacALLISTER: Benjamin Abbott, followed
15 by Janet Greenwald.

16 MR. BENJAMIN ABBOTT: I have a process
17 question. Why is it necessary for you to stand next
18 to the speakers?

19 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: It's kind of
20 threatening, intimidating.

21 MR. MacALLISTER: It's for the speakers.
22 There is a yellow card that is a 30-second warning,
23 and there's a red card, so I don't have to stand here
24 unless people don't respect the process.

25 MR. BENJAMIN ABBOTT: I'm going to be

1 pretty brief. My name is Benjamin Abbott. I'm a
2 grad student at UNM. Like Marcus, I want to thank
3 everyone else who has spoken and echo a lot of their
4 concerns. But what I want to emphasize is the fact
5 that the project is not going to build anything
6 useful. I mean, it's absolutely important to have
7 jobs and money in northern New Mexico, in this state.
8 I think we should just take the money and do
9 something useful with it, because currently,
10 plutonium pits are not going to help anyone. It
11 would be much better for the entire species if you
12 just paid the people to do absolutely nothing. That
13 would be vastly superior. You pay them to party,
14 basically. But as dangerous as a wild party is, it's
15 not as dangerous as this facility, according to all
16 the testimony we've had today.

17 So that's what I want to emphasize, that
18 there's no reason for any of this. We should take
19 the money and do something useful with it. There are
20 so many things that need to be done, there are so
21 many people suffering, people not having a good
22 standard of living, there's education systems going
23 downhill, the energy system in this country needs to
24 be complete, and transportation needs to be
25 completely revamped. The money can be spent on so

1 many good things, so this project should be opposed
2 for whatever reasoning, anything you can do to stop
3 it and put the money into somewhere good should be
4 done. Thank you. (Applause.)

5 MR. MacALLISTER: Janet Greenwald, followed
6 by John Lockridge.

7 MS. JANET GREENWALD: Well, I think what I
8 have to say probably relates mostly to risk. I moved
9 to New Mexico when I was in my early 20s, and bought
10 a farm downwind from Los Alamos. If I had known that
11 Los Alamos was there, I might not have done that. My
12 family lives there still. So once I found out
13 Los Alamos was there, and started to begin to
14 understand nukes and what they were all about and
15 what Los Alamos was about, I joined CARD and came
16 down to Albuquerque and worked in the office a day a
17 week. CARD paid my bus fair, I think, for a number
18 of years. And I became known as an antinuclear
19 activist in the north and around Albuquerque, and for
20 some reason people at Los Alamos, because I never
21 passed on what they said, would sometimes call me and
22 talk to me about what they were experiencing up
23 there. I would work at the office late at night, so
24 these calls would always happen late at night.

25 The first one was from a woman who had just

1 lost her husband at Los Alamos. She said he was a
2 high administrator. She said that he had died from
3 cancer. She said a lot of people she knew were dying
4 of cancer. She told me that the little stream that
5 ran through her backyard, her beautiful backyard, was
6 contaminated. I asked her if she would come forward
7 and talk about these things, and she said if she came
8 forward, that her family at Los Alamos would be
9 ostracized. And so no, she was not going to come
10 forward.

11 Then some years later, I received a call
12 from a friend of mine about our friend Tyler, who
13 lived at Los Alamos. Tyler had discovered a brain
14 cancer cluster up at Los Alamos, and my friend called
15 me to tell me that his house had been burned down,
16 and that he and his family would be moving out of
17 New Mexico.

18 So then years later, I'm working late in my
19 office again, and I get a call from a nuclear
20 scientist. Well, he wasn't -- let's see how to
21 state. His training was -- it was not a physicist.
22 I don't want to go into it any more, but it was the
23 night of the Cerro Grande fire, and he called me up
24 because he said there was a bunker at Los Alamos and
25 that there were prototypes of nuclear bombs in that

1 bunker, and he was terrified that the fire was going
2 to reach the bunker, and he said if it did, we would
3 all be gone. So he started out very upset, and then
4 I talked to him for about an hour, and he gradually
5 got less upset, and then he began to back pedal and
6 say, "No, it will be fine, it will be all right."

7 So now I no longer work late in my office.
8 I'm in my mid-60s, and if there are calls coming in
9 from people at Los Alamos who are upset by one thing
10 or another, they just get an answering machine. So
11 for me, building another bomb building at
12 Los Alamos -- it just seems like insanity, just
13 insanity. And who is the enemy? Who is the enemy?
14 Maybe it's like the poet said. Maybe we found out
15 that it was ourselves. Thank you.

16 MR. MacALLISTER: John Lockridge followed
17 by Flora Barrett.

18 MR. JOHN LOCKRIDGE: My name is John
19 Lockridge. Thank you for the opportunity to speak
20 here. I wish we would get 100 percent of our time
21 instead of 60 percent or 40 percent reduction. It
22 seems fairly extreme.

23 Anyway, to get on with it, since we don't
24 have much time, there has been a lot said about the
25 EIS itself. I think the EIS is really almost

1 secondary to the real problem of violation of a
2 nuclear treaty that we have. We have this nuclear
3 nonproliferation treaty that we are signatory to here
4 in the United States, and we are supposed to honor
5 what we sign, I believe. I don't believe that's
6 being done in this case. A lot of people -- some of
7 the DOE people may say -- and some others, too --
8 that this is really just replacement of existing
9 pits. But I don't know, and I don't know that as a
10 citizen of New Mexico I'll ever find out unless we
11 work for DOE. The truth of the matter, I believe
12 there are probably going to be some enhancements to
13 the pits, probably in the name of safety or something
14 like that. But they won't be the same pits. They
15 won't be just replacement pits for the ones that are
16 already in existence. We already have thousands of
17 bombs that are lying around the country, about 2000
18 or more here, I believe, at Kirtland.

19 Another thing that has been mentioned
20 before, but I think is important to restate, is that
21 the environmental threat is extreme. At least a
22 couple of people, I believe, have mentioned the
23 seismic problems. But not only that, there is
24 already contamination up at Los Alamos from poorly
25 maintained pits. They don't have accurate records.

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 There's pits down here at Kirtland Air Force Base,
2 Los Alamos, I guess, actually -- or not Los Alamos.
3 But Sandia Labs. Not really the Air Force base, I
4 guess. But we've already seen how our government
5 does not maintain safety issues for us that should be
6 maintained. We are supposed to be protecting the
7 people of the country, not destroying the people of
8 the country, and I think we're just introducing more
9 and more threats to our population by allowing this
10 to happen. So I think just on the basis of the
11 treaty that it seems to me that we're violating, we
12 should not even consider having an EIS. We should
13 consider ending the project.

14 And at that, since I don't know how much
15 time more I may have, I'm just going to end it there.
16 Thank you for the time. (Applause.)

17 MR. MacALLISTER: Flora Barrett, followed
18 by number 16. I don't have a name.

19 MS. FLORA BARRETT: Yes, my name is Flora
20 Barrett, and I am speaking for myself. I heard
21 earlier a mention that nuclear weapons are obsolete.
22 That is my message. And so I'm going to say it
23 again, because I have had planned all along to say
24 nuclear weapons are obsolete. Why would we build
25 more nuclear weapons when we can't use them? Why are

1 we going to put money into something that can never
2 be used? We have said all along that we can't use
3 these weapons. So why would we build more of them?

4 So shut down that plant. Don't put any
5 money in it. Close it completely, and let's talk
6 about how we can build sustainable nuclear and --
7 sustainable energy, solar, wind, and bio uses of
8 energy. To me, it doesn't make any sense to build
9 something you're never going to use. We can't use
10 it. There's no way we can put nuclear weapons out
11 there in the world. So close down whatever is there
12 of the CMRR and do not ever open it again.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am. The
15 person who signed in as number 16. I don't have a
16 name. Thank you, followed by Lilly Rendt.

17 NUMBER 16: Also no pictures, and I don't
18 want the film on, so you don't have my release of
19 confidentiality and my release of information to do
20 that.

21 I'm just going to give the basics of what
22 came up for me. I was born in Los Alamos, and I know
23 the big difference between Bechtel. Bechtel's a
24 corporation. It is not the old days of University of
25 California and the quaintness of University of

1 Chicago where the scientists were coming in and they
2 made \$45,000 for the year. These Bechtel guys are
3 coming in with gigantic salaries of \$100,000 and
4 above. They're not living in the little government
5 houses that are falling apart that were built in the
6 1950s. They're in the great big houses near the golf
7 course.

8 I think that because of this, we've lost
9 our ethics, we've lost our morality, and we're not
10 thinking of legacy and future generations.

11 The other thought I have, that I had, was:
12 Why risk it? Why risk it? And what I have seen in
13 the transition of how quaint Los Alamos used to be,
14 it's easy for Bechtel to come in, make big money off
15 of this and then split.

16 And then the other thing I was thinking of,
17 the downwinders were never paid off for the cancers
18 that they're still dealing with. The government made
19 promises to the downwinders, and those monies never
20 occurred for those people with thyroid and brain and
21 lung, et cetera, cancers.

22 This idea that we've got to make jobs,
23 build jobs off of nuclear, those construction
24 companies and those unions can make money off of
25 peace. They don't need a nuclear plant to have a job

1 from it.

2 And then the other thought I had was, I
3 thought I'd take it from a psychosocial point of
4 view. Why should we trust these people? I would
5 like alcohol and substance abuse testing and
6 psychological testing done of these new age
7 scientists that have come in. I want them tested.
8 (Applause.) Yeah, and when I look at the neighbors
9 that I have had in Los Alamos, I definitely want them
10 alcohol and substance abuse tested. Okay, just a
11 thought.

12 But the bottom line is: Why risk it? Why
13 risk it? (Applause.)

14 MR. MacALLISTER: Lilly Rendt, followed by
15 Susan Rodriguez.

16 MS. LILLY RENDT: I'm always amused at
17 these meetings because I go a long way back. I go
18 back to the '50s, when they were putting the Cullen
19 Foundation under New York City and underneath
20 Columbia University, and everybody was so afraid that
21 Columbia University would blow up, and they did have
22 a few accidents there. They were just starting.

23 But I was going to this gal who said we
24 ought to give them an education. Yes, here's a book
25 called "Complexity." And it talks about putting all

1 your facts into the computer before you make a
2 decision. And frankly, I think things that were put
3 into computer to decide upon in New Mexico had to be
4 very, very scarce. In other words, there weren't
5 very many factors that were considered, and when the
6 people here talk about some of the things that have
7 happened and some of the ways of our state, I don't
8 think you people know what you're doing, because this
9 is a very special state.

10 I just read a book about Alaska, about the
11 gates of Alaska, and I think that might be a good
12 place to put it. Let's make an effort to have them
13 change the whole venue up to Alaska and then the
14 Alaskans who are shooting wolves anyway might have
15 some interest in it. They want all the money, so if
16 money is the big issue, let's give it to them. I
17 mean, we've been a poor state for many, many years,
18 and I really don't mind.

19 But some people want to build things and
20 then not use them. And what would be the use of
21 nuclear energy at this point? We're trying to work
22 for world peace, not world war. And if we are, then
23 we ought to think carefully that we don't want to be
24 the center and, you know -- we don't want to be the
25 ones that are bombed.

1 Let's build these things somewhere on the
2 Nordic Sea where it can't do any harm to anyone.
3 There's no one up there. This man walked for miles
4 and miles with his two dogs and he didn't meet any
5 people, and his food drop didn't come down, and he
6 met some grizzly bears. He looked so pathetic, the
7 grizzly bears left him alone.

8 So let's see if we can somehow, somehow --
9 I don't know how exactly -- maybe through complexity
10 theory, where we really put all the factors into
11 play, or maybe -- well, all I know is, Japan made a
12 big mistake. They built on a small island and they
13 were hurt. And we are not a large state. Even
14 though we do have some mountains, for heaven's sake,
15 let's keep those nuclear facilities out of our state.
16 (Applause.)

17 MR. MacALLISTER: Susan Rodriguez followed
18 by Sarah Rodriguez.

19 MS. SUSAN RODRIGUEZ: I'm going to go over
20 some of these points, because I agree with all of
21 them, and to start with the first one I think that's
22 important, a new nuclear facility will detract from
23 the cleanup of the existing mess. So DOE made a
24 commitment to clean up the legacy waste at LANL when
25 it signed the consent order with the New Mexico

1 Environment Department on March 1, 2005. The order
2 requires cleanup of certain sites by December 31,
3 2015, including the area G dump site at Technical
4 Area 54. Construction activities for a new nuclear
5 facility will interfere with these cleanup
6 activities. DOE must devote taxpayer funds for
7 cleanup, not a new NF, which will only add to the
8 pollution.

9 Then I'll skip to another point about these
10 pits, 80 pits. DOE must conduct a capacity study to
11 determine whether the existing facilities can be used
12 instead of building the proposed NF, which would
13 increase pit manufacturing to at least 80 pits a
14 year. Now, I have the number 20 and it says here
15 existing facilities have sufficed since 1999, when
16 DOE limited plutonium pit manufacturing to 20, and I
17 thought that was a lot, but to go up to 80 is
18 absolutely crazy. Since the US treaty obligations
19 forbid both new nuclear designs and increased numbers
20 of nuclear weapons in the US arsenal, pits to be
21 manufactured are touted as stockpiled stewardship,
22 which I have heard for the past 20 years here, for
23 maintaining existing nuclear weapons through
24 replacement of old pits. There's something called
25 the Jason study, however, of aging plutonium that

1 argues against the need for pit replacement within
2 the next 100 years.

3 The manufacturing of these pits is
4 dangerous and the pollution is a threat to the health
5 and safety of those living downwind and downstream,
6 so that's us here in Albuquerque.

7 Los Alamos National Laboratories inherited
8 the US pit manufacturing from Rocky Flats, which was
9 one of my points. Rocky Flats -- you should Google
10 that one. We inherited that one, Rocky Flats, in
11 Colorado, just north of Denver, was a place where
12 they produced these pits and they made such a mess of
13 it that the FBI had to come down and close them down
14 because they were about to poison the drinking water
15 of Denver.

16 Now, that is just news, guys. You know,
17 this is just -- and so now we have CCNS that has
18 looked into the Buckman well and they have found
19 plutonium and all the other stuff that -- I'm not a
20 nuclear person -- so it's all this stuff that you
21 don't want in your drinking water, and here in
22 Albuquerque we have not yet had -- the Albuquerque
23 Water Utility Authority has not seen fit to even try
24 to test that. You can't test for this enough because
25 it will go through. It's so small, you have to test

1 for this much, and you don't even want to breathe in
2 any of that plutonium. It's deadly. The money spent
3 on unusable nuclear weapons is nuts for economic
4 growth.

5 This is the last point, but I think the
6 Republicans ought to pay attention to this. It goes
7 down the black hole of corporate pockets.
8 Los Alamos, the richest county per capita in the
9 United States, does not need US budgetary charity,
10 but it consumes the lion's share of federal funds
11 coming to New Mexico. The rest of New Mexico, one of
12 the nation's poorest states, cries out for the
13 fulfillment of real human needs. Money for
14 education, health care, green jobs, renewable energy,
15 public transportation, would all keep circulating and
16 get our money growing again -- get our economy
17 growing again. Thank you. Let's put some sanity
18 into this. (Applause.)

19 MR. MacALLISTER: Sarah Rodriguez, followed
20 by Manuel Pino.

21 MS. SARAH RODRIGUEZ: My name is Sarah. I
22 am currently a chemistry major and a dual Spanish
23 major at the University of New Mexico. I'm only 22.
24 Be these plutonium pits will hurt my generation and
25 the one after that. I have known my friends -- I

1 have had some friends who have died of cancer who are
2 my age. I do not want anybody to have that feeling
3 of loss. Thank you. (Applause.)

4 MR. MacALLISTER: Manuel Pino, followed by
5 Joni Arends.

6 MR. MANUEL PINO: (In Navajo.) My name is
7 Manuel Pino, from Acoma Pueblo. My entire life I
8 grew up in what is known as the Grants mineral belt.
9 The Grants mineral belt is one of the largest
10 ore-producing areas in the world. This 50-year
11 legacy of the nuclear industry in our backyard has
12 caused nothing but pain and suffering for Laguna,
13 Acoma, and Navajo people in Cibola and McKinley
14 Counties, extending into the Navajo Nation in
15 Arizona.

16 It does not surprise me, standing here as
17 an indigenous man, that the United States Government
18 is again breaking another treaty, the nuclear
19 proliferation treaty. The United States Government
20 has broken over 500 to this day. In this 50-year
21 legacy, we have experienced the Jackpile Mine, the
22 largest open pit uranium mine in the world. The
23 Homestake Mill, consistently from the mid-1950s
24 through the 1980s, one of the largest mill producers
25 in the world. We have experienced the Church Rock

1 spill, 15 miles east of Gallup, considered along with
2 Three Mile Island as the worst nuclear accident in
3 the United States. Japan and Canada are currently
4 proposing a mine and mill north of our sacred
5 mountain, Mt. Taylor, which recently received a
6 traditional cultural property designation by the
7 State Historic Preservation Office of New Mexico that
8 was challenged by the mining industry and pro-nuclear
9 populations in Cibola County, and the TCP designation
10 was reversed.

11 I know that in close proximity to
12 Los Alamos we have numerous sacred sites that are
13 sacred to San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, Ohkay Owingeh,
14 Tesuque, and numerous others of our sister pueblos in
15 the north. And you know, I have learned historically
16 that many of these impacts to the pueblos were
17 after-the-fact realization. And again, I want to
18 make sure that there is full consultation of pueblo
19 people in those northern pueblos, that they have free
20 prior and informed consent in this decision-making
21 process, as we were denied that in the Grants mineral
22 belt in many of these historical contamination
23 legacies. We have cancer clusters in our community,
24 both of working and nonworking populations today.
25 You go to my people and ask them if they want any

1 form of nuclear energy.

2 You know, it's hard for us to conceive as
3 indigenous peoples, when we were studying the
4 Jackpile Mine, that of the 24 million tons of ore,
5 over 90 percent of that went to one source, the
6 Department of Defense, to make weapons of mass
7 destruction. When we tell our elders that this big
8 hole in their front yard was going for that purpose,
9 they were appalled. They were blown away.

10 We have lived with the contamination of the
11 nuclear industry not only in the Grants mineral belt,
12 but if you go to western Shoshoni land in Nevada,
13 they were the most bombed nation in the world before
14 the aboveground testing was banned. If you go to
15 northern Saskatchewan today, where Dineh and Cree
16 people live, you'll find the most intense mined and
17 milled area of North America. We are sick and tired
18 of disproportionately providing unsafe energy to this
19 country, and we want it to stop. (Applause.)

20 MR. MacALLISTER: Joan Arends, followed by
21 M. J. Mahan.

22 MS. JONI ARENDS: Good evening. My name is
23 Joni Arends. I'm with Concerned Citizens for Nuclear
24 Safety. I would like to talk about the need for a
25 public hearing exactly the same as this in the Taos

1 community. Mayor Darren Cordova asked for a hearing.
2 He was denied, but offered a briefing. Sixty people
3 in the Taos region signed a petition in support of
4 the mayor's request. Thirty nongovernmental
5 organizations and four individuals signed a separate
6 letter asking for hearing in Taos. And one of the
7 justifications for the request was because that
8 community was in the plume of the Cerro Grande fire
9 for weeks and the plume was orange.

10 So I would like to renew that request for a
11 hearing just like this, where people could make
12 public comments, where they can hear one another, the
13 same type of hearing as here in Albuquerque, as will
14 be held in Los Alamos tomorrow night, in Espanola on
15 Wednesday night, and in Santa Fe on Thursday night.
16 There's plenty of time between now and the end of the
17 comment period on June 28th for a public hearing in
18 the Taos community. Thank you. (Applause.)

19 MR. MacALLISTER: M. J. Mahan, followed by
20 David Bacon.

21 MS. M.J. MAHAN: I'd like to yield to
22 Mr. Hancock, if he's still here.

23 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, ma'am. Is
24 Mr. Hancock?

25 MR. HANCOCK: I'm glad to speak. I'd like

1 to let the other people go ahead, and I'll speak at
2 the end, if necessary. If you have something to say,
3 feel free to say it.

4 MS. M.J. MAHAN: Okay. Well, I was very
5 anxious to hear some positive suggestions. I'm very
6 much against building more bombs. I have been way up
7 in the Arctic Circle, where you could look over and
8 see where the Russians were doing their atomic work
9 and their pollution, and it frightens the life out of
10 me. I went up in the Gutenhurten (phonetic) in
11 Norway. There's plenty up there.

12 More and more, it becomes obvious that we
13 are one world, and what we do in one place affects
14 everything else. I was here in New Mexico as a
15 child, long before the '50s. We moved out, got
16 transferred. My dad got transferred out in 1942. My
17 great grandmother was here. She was principal of
18 First Ward School.

19 I came back here from New Orleans. I don't
20 have much. I had a wonderful life as a teacher, and
21 I loved it in Catholic schools. But I didn't get
22 much money, and all I had was my little home in New
23 Orleans, my home for 25 years, and I thought with the
24 hurricanes coming, with the threat to one of the
25 largest ports in the United States, I thought, well,

1 I'm going to go back home to my querencia, the land
2 where my family came from seven generations ago.

3 So I came back. Little did I know that I
4 was sitting right on top of Sandia Labs. And we know
5 that because people finally wouldn't be quiet, they
6 have finally listened to us, and they're drilling
7 more wells, and we know that the pollution is
8 spreading, spreading, spreading.

9 So it's a very sad thing. New Mexico's a
10 wonderful place. I grew up here. My mom and dad
11 would sing the song, "Oh, fair New Mexico, we love,
12 we love you so." They met at UNM in the 1920s, late
13 '20s.

14 So anyway, I do hope that a solution can be
15 found. I'm glad that people are at least letting us
16 speak. I wish they would listen. That's my hope,
17 that they will listen, and that we will get our land
18 back, our beautiful New Mexico. Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. MacALLISTER: David Bacon.

21 MR. DAVID BACON: I come to these events to
22 talk to, you know, my fellow human beings. I was at
23 a committee that Senator Bingaman chaired three weeks
24 ago in Santa Fe. He's the head of Energy and Natural
25 Resources, and he was presented with the data on

1 what's going to happen to the Colorado and Rio Grande
2 river basins due to climate change. And it was
3 serious data that he had received, you know. We're
4 just starting to crash and burn when it comes to our
5 own river basins. River flows will diminish, snow
6 pack will diminish, storms will get heavier but less
7 frequent. He came out of that meeting shaken, and
8 Paula Garcia, the head of the acequia association,
9 said in the paper the next day she was shocked at
10 what she heard.

11 Now, that \$6 billion that we're going to
12 throw away or the DOE is going to throw away -- well,
13 \$6 billion and counting that they're going to throw
14 away -- would translate into 10,000 jobs at \$30 an
15 hour over ten years. We know what we need to do.
16 DOE doesn't know anything. TEPCO didn't know
17 anything. BP didn't know anything. The Army Corps
18 of Engineers didn't know anything. Nature always
19 wins. It always wins. We might as well get used to
20 that and start planning for the future that we know
21 is coming, rather than pretending that we can build
22 these things and that we know what will happen.

23 Fukushima. The damage occurred during the
24 earthquake, not the tsunami. They know that now.
25 And they know that the level of the meltdown

1 astonished those so-called experts in Fukushima.
2 What we have to do -- and it was clear in the
3 testimony to Senator Bingaman -- we have to begin
4 restoration of our watersheds. We have to begin
5 restoration of our grasslands. We have to begin the
6 massive deployment of nonwater-consumptive clean
7 energy that doesn't create any waste. We have to put
8 people to work. To do this, we have to create
9 healthy soils, we have to create healthy river
10 systems, we have to create health in our own natural
11 resources again.

12 This isn't rocket science, fortunately.
13 With just this money, we could begin a serious
14 endeavor to at least stave off what we know is going
15 to be happening to our river basins. I would hope
16 that we can begin now to focus on this, and to
17 completely pull money out of DOE and Los Alamos. We
18 should not spend another dime up there.

19 We now know how to restore -- a lot of
20 people who are outside the sort of traditional
21 scientific community know how to restore grasslands,
22 river sheds, and so forth, watersheds. We know how
23 to do it. We should be putting all our money into
24 these people, into the small communities in the rural
25 areas, into the damaged forests and the damaged

1 watersheds that have been damaged because we've
2 pushed our energy to the limit. We push everything
3 to the limit. We have to back off. We have to start
4 working with nature. We know that, and we ought to
5 get on with it, and I don't think we can change the
6 focus of DOE, but we can create an entirely new
7 restorative scientific and civil community and begin
8 to save the planet. Thank you. (Applause.)

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Has everybody who
10 completed a registration form had a chance to speak?
11 Has anybody not had a chance to speak who completed
12 one?

13 Okay. How many people who are still
14 present are interested in making another comment?
15 Three? Okay. We have time. And I'd also like to
16 remind you again that you have unlimited time and
17 unlimited numbers of opportunities to submit comments
18 through the other venues in the back corner, and
19 venues like the mail, phone, and fax. So tonight is
20 not by any means your only opportunity. In addition,
21 we have the other three meetings.

22 Sir, is there a question?

23 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Yes. How can your
24 calculations for the facility site be correct when
25 you can't even calculate that there was plenty of

1 time for five-minute presentations rather than
2 three-minute presentations? It's now 7:00, and this
3 is supposed to run until 9:00. That's two more
4 hours. You know? That's a pretty poor calculation
5 on your part, and a lot of interruption of a lot of
6 people that wanted to say something in a cohesive,
7 coherent manner. So you have insulted this audience
8 by your ineffectual and improper rule-making.

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir, for the
10 comment. And just for the record, two points. I
11 apologize if anybody did feel intimidated by my
12 standing here. The intention was to facilitate
13 everybody being able to turn through -- it wasn't
14 available to me at the outset how many people may
15 still be registering and coming through, so I was
16 intent on making sure that everybody had a chance to
17 at least make their comment.

18 Secondly, I can't speak to the calculation.
19 I take the number that I'm told as the facilitator.
20 So at this point, I would like to start the second
21 round, and invite people in the order that they
22 raised their hand to come and speak. Ma'am?

23 NUMBER 16: The other thing that DOE
24 doesn't get is that people don't trust you. There's
25 no trust built, and trust is earned, so that when

1 you're speaking, you know, Bechtel babble, people
2 don't trust you. You broke trust. There's no reason
3 for anybody to trust any of you.

4 MR. MacALLISTER: Okay. The comment --
5 since it wasn't on the mic, I'm not sure it was
6 picked up. But the comment was that there is no
7 reason to trust us, that the calculations broke
8 trust; is that it?

9 NUMBER 16: No, just in general. People
10 have no reason to trust you.

11 MR. MacALLISTER: Understood. Okay. So
12 other people who would like to approach the mic and
13 make a comment, please raise your hand, and I'll call
14 you in the order of your hand raised.

15 Sir, in the yellow shirt.

16 MR. DENNIS HOLLOWAY: Just one more comment
17 from an architect. You know, Fukushima is on all of
18 our minds right now. If it isn't, it should be. And
19 you should be reading online what actually is going
20 on, because there's a news blackout. Tokyo people
21 are being very, very highly radiated right now, and
22 we're not hearing it on our news. I want to say
23 that, you know, when Fukushima was built, I'm sure
24 that jobs were the big issue in those counties,
25 weren't they? They convinced the counties that

1 they're going to get lots of work. But you know, the
2 difference between that and what we're talking about
3 here, which is potential job creation, is that people
4 know what a nuclear reactor is and how it works. We
5 don't know what's going to be done inside that
6 building, because it's a security problem, and we're
7 not going to be told. So why should we do carte
8 blanche and say on an earthquake fault and volcanic
9 area that this kind of a very sensitive processing
10 facility should be built on a 50-foot hole with
11 concrete it in, or a 100-foot hole with concrete in
12 it?

13 I don't care. As an architect, this is
14 total psycho babble. There's no sense to it
15 structurally, and everybody in this room who I don't
16 see again -- we should talk and we should try to find
17 a way to get an analysis of that whole idea because
18 that's the weak point here. There is no structural
19 rational basis for implementing this kind of
20 sensitive process.

21 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir. Who
22 would like to speak next? Ma'am.

23 MS. M.J. MAHAN: Thank you. One of the big
24 issues I feel is the job issue. And there are so
25 many different ways to create jobs that are positive,

1 instead of putting all our money into something that
2 is going to -- I mean, it's a war issue. I mean, why
3 do we want to put all of our funds into something
4 that is only a war implement? I just can't see it.
5 I feel like if we were to put that money, like these
6 people said, into agriculture -- although
7 agriculture, I think we put so much housing into
8 New Mexico now, I don't know if we can ever have
9 agriculture again, the way we had it.

10 And this is one of the things I felt was a
11 device. Years ago, there was so much empty land, and
12 you could look for miles. And now when you go from
13 here to Santa Fe, you see nothing but buildings and,
14 you know, different structures, casinos, mister from
15 Acoma there. You know, it has changed. And I always
16 said we were not the largest state. I grew up in
17 Minnesota. And there are 10,000 lakes in Minnesota.
18 The water will never deplete there.

19 But I had a vision one time of how about
20 transporting water to places where it's needed?
21 California did it. And they brought plenty of water
22 from up north down into southern California. And
23 they have beautiful aquifers there. And this is one
24 thing we could do. And there are all sorts of dreams
25 that I have. But one of them is not blowing up

1 things.

2 Somehow something has happened to
3 New Mexico. We never thought that way years ago. I
4 came here in 1966. My husband died in Vietnam, and I
5 had to be the full support of my three children and
6 myself. New Mexico gave me a house to live in, gave
7 me a good job, I was a teacher for 30 years here, 53
8 altogether. And you know, I count my blessings. But
9 I don't want them ruined. I do not want New Mexico
10 ruined by a nuclear explosion or anything to do with
11 it.

12 You know, frankly, I don't think you people
13 know what you're doing. I have heard not one word
14 from you people about -- or haven't seen any charts
15 like I see over at the Cesar Chavez place when
16 Kirtland gives a demonstration. You haven't given
17 one iota of information of what you really want to
18 do. You only give it in the papers and the
19 journalists mess it up anyway. They don't know what
20 they're saying. I'm sorry, but that is the truth.
21 Sometimes I look at them and, you know, I really feel
22 sorry for the mentality of the news reports on this.
23 And you know, if we had some booklets or something --
24 but you brought nothing, and yet you expect us to
25 welcome you with open arms, and I'm not sure I want

1 that kind of bienvenidos aqui.

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Sir, you had your hand
3 up. Is there somebody else who would like to -- you
4 will be next, sir.

5 MR. CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ BEJERANO: One of
6 the points of -- my name is Carrillo Rodriguez
7 Bejerano, and I'm a 22-year resident of the state of
8 New Mexico, if that helps you. One of the points
9 that this particular society such as ours that we are
10 told -- developed society -- is the fact that we
11 think that we are rational in several of the things
12 that we do. Just tonight, just a simple point, we
13 were not even able to calculate how much time we
14 actually had available for comments. This is just a
15 very simple proof of -- how shall I put it -- how
16 ignorant we are of everything that we are trying to
17 do.

18 Now, to me, the question of this nuclear
19 weapons is a total -- it just has no logic
20 whatsoever. It has no logic for one particular point
21 to begin with. If we were ever going to go into a
22 war with another nation that also had nuclear
23 weapons, we would all be in real serious trouble. It
24 would be not a question of, "Oh, we're just going to
25 wait another 50 years and all this Agent Orange will

1 dissipate into the vegetation or whatever we bombed
2 over there in Vietnam," or, "Well, you know, we
3 didn't find weapons of mass destruction there in
4 Iraq, but they were there indeed. That's why we
5 thought they would be there," and so on and so forth.

6 But in the case of a nuclear war, we don't
7 get it. We would all reap that particular good thing
8 of having these devices that are capable of
9 destroying humanity many times over. So to me, that
10 is not logical.

11 Secondly, it is not logical either that we
12 expect all this money, billions and billions, as the
13 gentleman just said, counting on something that we
14 could not possibly use, while at the same time we are
15 arguing that senior citizens should give up some of
16 their particular hard-earned rights to having
17 Medicare and also Medicaid, although not necessarily
18 for seniors, but the Medicare and the Social Security
19 that was fought by those who came behind us, simply
20 because we don't have enough money, but we do have
21 enough money, we think we have enough money, to spend
22 billions of dollars on that particular foolish
23 enterprise in Los Alamos. Build more nuclear
24 weapons. What for? Whom are we going to attack with
25 these things? Are we going to be able to defend

1 ourselves if someone throws a nuclear weapon at us?
2 Of course we will. And we will throw a nuclear
3 weapon at them. To what effect? We would all
4 perish. So we could then say, "Oh, well, that place
5 was after all safe. That particular fault, well,
6 what does it matter anymore?"

7 No, it's not just putting it in somewhere
8 else. It's not just saying, "Oh, well, I don't want
9 it here in the state of New Mexico." I don't want it
10 anywhere in the world. The world is a beautiful
11 place. There's not just our state. It's the entire
12 planet, which is a beautiful place. We should simply
13 not have it. Yes, there's no foundation for this
14 thing. Structurally speaking, this is stupidity at
15 the highest degree, and it's very costly. Thank you.
16 (Applause.)

17 BOB: My name is Bob and I have been coming
18 to these hearings for about 30 years. What's that
19 definition of insanity? If you keep doing the same
20 thing over and over again and you expect different
21 results? It's not happening, you know? And I have
22 been sitting back there listening to people talk and
23 trying to figure out, what is it going to take to
24 really stop these people? And the only thing that I
25 can see that's going to stop them is the same thing

1 that happened in Tunisia and the same thing that
2 happened in Egypt. People are going to have to stand
3 up to the powers that be in this country and say,
4 "We're not going to take it anymore. We're not going
5 to do it anymore. We're mad as hell, that you're
6 spending the money that we give you to kill us.
7 We're tired of it."

8 And I don't understand where all the young
9 people are, you know. All the people -- I mean, I
10 just don't understand. Do they not care? Is our
11 educational system so screwed up that they can't even
12 see what's in their own self's best interest? You
13 know? I don't understand. Are we so propagandized
14 by the TV and the media that people don't understand
15 what's at stake? I guess people aren't going to be
16 in the street until we can't drink the water anymore
17 and we can't breathe the air, but it will be too late
18 then, you know. It will be too late. (Applause.)

19 MR. MacALLISTER: Mr. Hancock, and is there
20 somebody else who wants to speak after Mr. Hancock?
21 Pam and Sarah.

22 MR. DON HANCOCK: So let's get some numbers
23 out so that we, the guinea pigs in Albuquerque, can
24 help John and Roger and the rest of the folks at the
25 forthcoming hearings.

1 These hearings were noticed for public
2 comment between 5:45 and 9:00. At five minutes
3 apiece, that means 39 people can speak. Nobody needs
4 to be cut off. So tonight, the first round, there
5 were 23 people who spoke. So there was no reason at
6 all to cut off the comments.

7 Those of us who have been at many hearings
8 had said to Roger and other people in advance. "Give
9 people five minutes. Some people will take them. A
10 lot of people will not take all of the five minutes."

11 So the rule of thumb that I would argue you
12 should use for the forthcoming hearings, unless you
13 have 45 people or more signed up, give them five
14 minutes. You'll still be through on time. So that's
15 one number that you need to think about.

16 Another number that you need to think about
17 are your own regulations. The Department of Energy's
18 own regulations say that notice for any public
19 hearing has to be provided 15 days in advance.

20 Unfortunately, the Department of Energy can't count
21 to 15 in this case, because this Albuquerque hearing
22 was not noticed 15 days in advance. The card that I
23 received in the mail from John arrived to me on May
24 19th. Four days. Not 15 days. Four days before the
25 hearing. The legal Federal Register notice for this

1 hearing was May 16th, last Monday. That's seven
2 days, not 15 days before the event.

3 So once again, this is another example, and
4 I'm going to go into a couple of more. I have
5 already mentioned the fact of how illegal the
6 document is. This particular hearing was not
7 properly noticed. That's a big problem. The
8 Department of Energy can't count, can't follow its
9 own regulations in terms of the minimal things about
10 the law.

11 Let me give another number from their own
12 document. The document says that the preferred
13 alternative building, the shiny new bomb plant at
14 Los Alamos, that's the only alternative they're
15 considering -- that plant is supposed to operate for
16 50 years. Five-zero. During that time, if it were
17 to operate, every year it creates waste, nuclear
18 waste. And so the alternative that has to be
19 considered is where is the disposal site in
20 conjunction with this facility for the low-level
21 waste and the transuranic waste that this facility is
22 going to create through the year 2070, using their
23 numbers that it starts operating about 2020, 2022,
24 and operates for 50 years? So where is the waste
25 site?

1 So the alternative -- this document also
2 has to look at the alternative of a permanent waste
3 site at Los Alamos for all the waste that this
4 facility is going to create. In looking at that, it
5 needs to consider a couple of things. It needs to
6 consider the testimony you heard from Manny Pino, and
7 that other Department of Energy people have heard
8 over the years from folks at San Ildefonso and Santa
9 Clara and other pueblos about how this would be
10 degradation of their sacred sites.

11 That is not in this document. That's why
12 you need to do a new document, start over, and get
13 this kind of information in. And you need to
14 understand that the Department of Energy has no
15 disposal site that's even on its planning going out
16 to 2070 for these kinds of wastes. So this document
17 needs to discuss the alternatives to do that.

18 The other thing that needs to be said is
19 that when you can't calculate numbers like 39 times
20 five minutes is three hours and 15 minutes, you can't
21 count to 15, in terms of adequate notice, you can't
22 comply with your own regulations, that does not
23 inspire public confidence that you can operate the
24 existing facilities at Los Alamos or any new facility
25 like you're talking about doing in this document.

1 You need to go back and start over and come back to
2 us when you have real reasonable alternatives and
3 real rigorous analysis that the law requires you to
4 do. (Applause.)

5 MR. MacALLISTER: Ma'am.

6 NUMBER 16: I also want to make one more
7 comment. People think that there's security in
8 Los Alamos and that people are watching. A couple
9 weekends ago, I was driving down from the Jemez and
10 there were a couple of kids with paint ball things
11 that had gotten under the fence into the lab proper.
12 There was no security there.

13 The other thing that I'm thinking of is
14 when the Cerro Grande fire happened, that was one
15 match essentially lit on a windy day, and when you
16 see the response in Los Alamos of what happened on
17 that day, nobody knew what they were doing. I mean,
18 Bandelier said that it was Santa Fe. Santa Fe said
19 Los Alamos should come in. The labs waited a long
20 time, you know, until it was right at the fence. So
21 if you can't get the Cerro Grande fire right, how are
22 they going to get something bigger correct? Right?

23 And so people have a very naive idea that
24 there's security in Los Alamos. They're asleep at
25 the wheel. If somebody wanted to go in and really

1 hurt Los Alamos and the world, it would only take --
2 they're not paying attention in the air waves up
3 there that, you know, there's a little small airport.
4 I mean, a little Cessna coming through Los Alamos --
5 I mean, think on it. They haven't second-guessed
6 what other people already know, that there's no
7 security in Los Alamos. People aren't paying
8 attention. It's a false sense of security up there.
9 Again, why risk it? You know? (Applause.)

10 MR. MacALLISTER: Ma'am, I believe you were
11 next?

12 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you.
13 Whether we are employed with the federal government
14 or not, we know that these public hearings are mere
15 rituals and that what we say here has little
16 significance in what will be done because we're on a
17 coast-to-coast federal reservation, and if we studied
18 the dynamics of control of the individual tribal
19 reservations at the beginning of the 1800s, we will
20 see the same dynamics being played out coast to
21 coast. The solution and how it should be performed
22 remains the question, and is to remove who's at the
23 helm, because those people at the helm have nothing
24 to do with the people, we the people. We need to
25 quit talking about "we" when we describe what they

1 are doing. We need to make a distinction between the
2 people's will and the will of the master, and unless
3 we do that clearly and in public forums, we will not
4 be able to gain the attention of those who are
5 totally uninformed.

6 Such hearings as these, with all the
7 electronic mediums we have, should be televised and
8 broadcast in their entirety. Announcements should
9 have been made about these meetings on the electronic
10 waves, as well as in the newspapers. The fact
11 remains that there are people in control who really
12 do not want public comment. It's merely a ritual to
13 be endured. I'm reminded of a saying of Patrick
14 Henry, one of the early revolutionaries of this
15 country, after the British Empire was dethroned here,
16 and for a short time, Patrick Henry and his
17 compatriots had an idea of self-government. Well,
18 that got waylaid with the passage of the federal
19 constitution, a mere 11 years after the conclusion of
20 the Revolutionary War. This history is not really
21 highlighted in the mainstream curricula of the public
22 schools or the universities, so we don't know the
23 history. But Patrick Henry understated the case when
24 he stated, "To erect and concentrate and perpetuate a
25 large money interest must, in the course of human

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 events, create one of two evils." We have both.

2 "The prostration of agriculture at the feet of
3 commerce and the change in the federal government
4 fatal to American liberty."

5 Under this private commercial jurisdiction
6 that we now live or reside under, owned by the owners
7 of the World Bank, the IMF, and the Federal Reserve
8 Bank, the cartel in this country, you know,
9 everything is prostrated to the feet of commerce.

10 But there's also a larger plan of world
11 domination. This nation is considered a potential
12 threat to the new world order, because we have that
13 history of the era of such people as Patrick Henry.
14 If we can revive that history and remember what it
15 was about and reinitiate the revival of the spirit of
16 the American Revolution, the new world order's plans
17 will be waylaid for another couple hundred years. So
18 to subdue awareness, we are piddling around with the
19 peripheral issues and not getting to the core issues:
20 Who's in control of our lives? It's not us. Does
21 talking to these people and petitioning them change
22 their course of action? I don't think so. In fact,
23 if you read the Declaration of Independence, one very
24 prominent phrase that sticks out in my mind is, "our
25 repeated petitions have been answered only by

1 repeated injury," and as Bob Hagee said when he was
2 up there, we've been doing this for 30 years, and is
3 repeating the same methods and expecting a different
4 result insanity, or are we fooling ourselves?

5 There has to be a different course of
6 action. Out here talking to each other, and mocking
7 the establishment doesn't work. We need to consider
8 how do we remove malevolent criminal syndicates from
9 the control of this country? How are we going to do
10 that? And if we don't ask ourselves that question,
11 we'll never get on the road to usurp the authority of
12 people who have no allegiance to this country. Their
13 allegiance is to a new world order. They want to
14 subdue this nation, and they're working on it with
15 many different projects, and they're doing a bad job
16 of it, and all of us will be victims of that if we
17 let them continue and institute a tyrannical
18 totalitarian regime.

19 MR. MacALLISTER: Who would like to speak
20 next?

21 MS. SUSAN RODRIGUEZ: And as some speakers
22 were talking about the danger of an accident up in
23 Los Alamos, I'm sure those of us know about 2,500.
24 Does that number ring a bell? Aren't there missiles
25 down there at Kirtland -- and they don't say whether

1 it's there or not, but there were missiles in that
2 carved-out mountain, and they pulled it out and now
3 it's down at Kirtland. And the question that we
4 asked the city council is, "Well, you have these
5 missiles. What is your plan for the City of
6 Albuquerque, for us to get out of here or do
7 something?" Like, "Oh, great, I-40."

8 I remember I had to go up to Santa Fe and
9 the president came into town, and Paseo -- I live on
10 that side -- I was stuck there in traffic for half an
11 hour. I was late to that meeting, which turned out
12 to be awful. Maybe Joni remembers that. It was a
13 company that was going to say they didn't find
14 anything in the Buckman well. They were so
15 disrespectful. Here the company is getting money to
16 look at a project and had the poster right up here
17 and us sitting back there. It was the most
18 disrespectful presentation I have ever seen. And it
19 was infuriating. And when they would talk to you,
20 they were using pieces of paper on a board and
21 markers. It was really kindergarten stuff.

22 I'm not as well-educated in the sciences as
23 my daughter and my husband, who has a Ph.D. from
24 Michigan, but I do have an education, and I have some
25 self-respect. These people didn't have any

1 self-respect and didn't have any courtesy to us. And
2 a lot are that way, but for us at least to remember
3 that we still have to deal with those missiles right
4 down there at Kirtland, and we have to get answers
5 from our delegates, because I don't know what
6 Mr. Fleck knows about it, but probably he knows
7 something. I don't know whether he's gotten any
8 answers, but if that's true, that's really scary.
9 Okay, thank you.

10 MR. MacALLISTER: Joni, I believe you were
11 next. Is there somebody who would like to speak
12 after Joni?

13 MS. JONI ARENDS: My name is Joni Arends.
14 I'm with Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. So
15 my comments are addressed to Steve Fong, to Roger
16 Snyder, to John Tegtmeier, to Bruce MacAllister.
17 How many groups got a little letter asking to make
18 sure that these public hearings included provisions
19 for people to be feeling comfortable? We asked that
20 we be able to, I believe, speak from the podium. I
21 guess we were supposed to speak there. That's not
22 going to work for the three other hearings.

23 I kind of feel like we're playing the same
24 game that we played with the White Rock scoping
25 meetings, that it was necessary to go in the other

1 room in order to make public comments.

2 When we went down to Pojoaque, there was
3 some accommodation made. I want to contrast again
4 the difference between when DOE headquarters does a
5 public meeting, like the recent Greater than Class C
6 Draft Environmental Impact Statement where we were
7 able to hear one another. There was a facilitator,
8 there was a court reporter. It's a very different
9 situation when either the Albuquerque Site Office or
10 Los Alamos National Laboratories is in charge of
11 holding these meetings.

12 Now, we spent time putting together an
13 e-mail to you all about what we needed for these
14 meetings, and what we found tonight is, we found the
15 facilitator standing behind the speakers in a very
16 intimidating way. That's not going to work in the
17 other three meetings, hopefully four. Hopefully
18 Roger is going to consent to a hearing in Taos
19 tonight.

20 I don't know why I need to spend my time
21 reprimanding the Department of Energy when we thought
22 that we had an agreement about the structure of these
23 hearings. I'm also very concerned about how we were
24 told originally that we would have five minutes each.
25 I felt a sigh of relief through the room, where

1 people thought, oh, I'm going to be able to say
2 everything that I wanted to say. And then we're cut
3 down to three minutes.

4 So either you have to decide that we're
5 having three minutes, or we're having five minutes.
6 I mean, Don already eloquently described all of this.
7 I didn't bring the memo with me or the request,
8 because I thought that this was all resolved. After
9 30 years, like Bob has said, there comes a point
10 where there's a level of respect, and I don't feel
11 that tonight. I don't feel it in this process where,
12 number one, our comments are being heard. We wrote
13 the e-mail in good faith in order to facilitate
14 public comment on this very serious matter. So we
15 can try it again tomorrow night. We'd like a podium,
16 we'd like the opportunity for everybody to hear one
17 another speak. We'd like a presentation by the
18 Department of Energy to explain this very complicated
19 material. Any other suggestions, Scott, Janet? Don?

20 You know, I don't want to get emotional,
21 but it makes me really, really sad, because I don't
22 understand if we have an agreement with John, who's
23 the document manager, or we have an agreement with
24 Elizabeth, or with Steve or with Roger, why, when we
25 travel 60 miles to be at this meeting, there isn't

1 that understanding that we're going to get what we
2 asked for when it was agreed upon.

3 So I probably said too much, but
4 Mr. MacAllister, it's really important that tomorrow
5 night you don't stand behind speakers. It's very
6 important that you calculate the amount of time. As
7 Don said, 39 speakers. You know, it's the same kind
8 of disrespect as was shown in the White Rock hearing,
9 or scoping meeting. And then the adjustments that
10 were made at the Pojoaque scoping meeting, and I hope
11 we don't have to fight about it tomorrow night.

12 Thank you. (Applause.)

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Ma'am, you were next, and
14 there is there somebody else who would like to speak?
15 Sir? You'll be next.

16 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: I have a question
17 to ask. I really support what Joni's been saying. I
18 have been part of these agreements, broken
19 agreements, I guess we could call them, and I'm
20 wondering, are you planning to stay until 9:00, since
21 it was announced that these hearings would go until
22 9:00? I mean, you know, because the people that are
23 here are done speaking does not necessarily mean that
24 someone might not come in later. So you'll be here
25 until 9:00? Okay.

1 And I want to reiterate what Bob has said
2 about the 30 years of hearings, and to say that, you
3 know, one more nuclear project for New Mexico. One
4 more. And then one more. And then one more. And
5 then uranium mining. Does that have to do with the
6 fact that we're one of the poorest states? Does it
7 have to do with the fact that we are a minority
8 majority state? Does it have to do with the fact
9 that we've had corrupt leaders that don't represent
10 us? Does it have to do with the passing of money and
11 making deals in back rooms? Why are all these
12 nuclear projects coming here? Most of the people in
13 New Mexico don't want them. Money and jobs. Money
14 and jobs. We're poor. We're up against the wall.
15 We have to have the money and jobs. You know? The
16 Department of Energy, Department of Energy, dear
17 Department of Energy, we need new ideas. We need the
18 rivers taken care of. We need alternative energy.
19 We don't need more nuclear projects. For us, you
20 know, it's a matter of environmental racism, among
21 other things, that these projects keep coming here.
22 That's all.

23 ERIC: Hi. My name is Eric. In defense of
24 Bruce getting behind people, I'm a master's in
25 geology, and I've been to many conferences, and it's

1 common for a moderator to get up when someone's time
2 is getting close. You shouldn't feel threatened by
3 it. It's happened to my advisors. Also my friends
4 have given talks. The person stands up to let them
5 know their time is up, and this happens at scientific
6 conferences. This is not the man trying to threaten
7 you. Even though you may feel that, I mean, in his
8 defense, it does happen and it's not personal.

9 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Says you.

10 ERIC: Yeah, says me, right. I have a
11 right to say it. Sorry. I'm probably the only one
12 that -- I agree with many of your --

13 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: This is not a
14 geological conference we're talking about.

15 ERIC: It's a common moderation technique
16 to let someone --

17 MR. MacALLISTER: The ground rules state
18 that the speaker has the floor and there's not
19 argument from the --

20 ERIC: I'm sorry, but it even happens in
21 calm, fun environments.

22 MS. SUSAN RODRIGUEZ: We're saying we don't
23 like it.

24 ERIC: Well, that's just the way moderation
25 is done.

1 MS. SUSAN RODRIGUEZ: We don't like it.

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Excuse me, ma'am. Again
3 I'm going by the ground rules. Let the speaker
4 speak. You'll have a chance to speak if you need.

5 ERIC: In terms of the timing, it's
6 probably pretty easy to gauge how much time someone
7 should have, but I think it's important, sir, you
8 brought this issue up, and everyone understands that
9 after everyone's done talking, people that might not
10 have had something to say might be encouraged to say
11 something based on what they have heard. So I think
12 it is important to have some time after the allotted
13 time has been taken for people to come up and perhaps
14 say something that they were inspired to say while
15 hearing others. And so I think there should be some
16 time afterwards. Maybe, you know, they left too much
17 time tonight, but I do think there should be some
18 time for people that are inspired to say something.
19 (Applause.)

20 MR. MacALLISTER: Is there another person
21 who would like to speak?

22 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: I just had this
23 piece that I was interested in saying before, and
24 when we were instructed about making our comments at
25 the beginning of the evening, we were told we were

1 supposed to engage in civil comments and behaviors,
2 civil manner, and represent high level of discourse.
3 Even that kind of -- that's a reprimand, as if we
4 didn't know how to speak our sentences and abide by
5 the general social rules. It sounds as if we were
6 some kind of rabble, "You just never know what
7 they're going to do."

8 Further, the moderator was not simply
9 signaling times up. He was standing behind you and
10 hovering in a way that, for people like me who don't
11 do much public speaking, is nerve-racking. I think
12 there are many ways to do moderation that are
13 congenial. I have spoken before, I have not fallen
14 apart. I find this setting, just my own personal
15 self, I find it -- not right now, but before -- very
16 difficult.

17 Anyway, this was the thing that I wanted to
18 add to the conversation, and that is sometimes we're
19 misled by phrases. There was an article on the
20 nuclear industry in The Reporter this last week,
21 nuclear industry in New Mexico, and a technician was
22 quoted as saying, quote, "The state's nuclear future
23 is bright."

24 I think the language is very misleading,
25 because we have not seen much benefit to the

1 communities of New Mexico from the federal funds that
2 have poured into the laboratory. It's not the
3 state's future that's bright. It's the nuclear
4 industry's future that is bright, and it's simply a
5 different kettle of fish from the state. The state
6 ought to be here for the benefit of the population,
7 and still we are suffering in our schools and our
8 social systems. I won't go into the list; everybody
9 else has done it. But I'm sure the man who was
10 quoted in this article saying the state's nuclear
11 future is bright -- I'm sure he was thinking that it
12 goes to everyone. But, in fact, it's a very, very
13 restricted benefit. That's all I have to say. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. MacALLISTER: Is there anybody else who
16 would like to speak? Sir.

17 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: In law, it's
18 called violation of due process. That's what Don
19 Hancock was talking about. It's also the arrogance
20 of power. You know, I went to the court hearings on
21 the lack of an environmental impact statement. The
22 environmental impact statement from 2003 and the
23 record of decision are dead and gone. That facility
24 cannot be built because of the seismic problems.
25 Okay? And you know, when it got right down to the

1 bottom line, Roger Snyder and his attorneys are
2 crying national security.

3 Now, I actually read some of these
4 documents that you people write and your
5 justification for not considering alternatives, and
6 when you dealt with the justification for not
7 building this facility at all, the justification was,
8 well, President Obama and Vice President Joe Biden
9 have said we got to have this.

10 Now, it's one thing to say that, and I can
11 see Roger smiling back there. But you know, it's
12 another thing when you have got Mr. Don Stosfield
13 (phonetic) pimping, pimping the federal government
14 for funds. You know? He goes to these conferences
15 and these budget hearings, and everything. He says,
16 you know, jeez, you know -- he combines with the
17 other lab directors, and they get together and they
18 say, you know, we've got to have this stuff for
19 national security to protect ourselves, you know.

20 It reminds me of a book I read years ago in
21 anthropology, and I'm not sure who wrote it, you
22 know, but it's about cannibals. And they would go
23 and grab one guy and take him back and cook him and
24 eat him, and then they'd get all paranoid, you know,
25 they'd be on the defensive, because they knew that

1 there was going to be some kind of revenge coming
2 down the road.

3 And that's where this country is with
4 national defense, you know. We're so paranoid about
5 the rest of the world. But more than that, it's a
6 monster money-maker for your people, isn't it?
7 That's what it's about, is the money. You have got
8 this project.

9 We've got -- this project's gone from
10 \$350 million and then when you discovered seismic
11 problems, it went to \$6 million. Now you're talking
12 about 12 years out into the future, to even finish
13 this thing assuming, assuming you can overcome the
14 seismic problems, and the engineering and design
15 problems that you are faced with, but that's another
16 12 years. So, let's figure, what was the percentage
17 rate of cost escalation from 350 million to
18 \$6 billion over -- let's see, from the time period of
19 2003 to 2011, that's eight years. I don't know, I
20 don't have a calculator in my head.

21 But if you are going to continue that kind
22 of escalation of costs, what are we looking at,
23 \$20 billion, you know, and then you make these silly
24 remarks in your Supplemental EIS about, well, gee,
25 the old CMR, won't work, but we're going to hold it

1 in reserve just in case that we run into financial
2 problems,

3 Well, which is it? You going to shut down
4 the CMR or not, you know.

5 Now, let's talk a little about the
6 arrogance of power, again, when it comes to
7 scientific investigation. You were supposed to
8 discover what the deep seismic status beneath TA55
9 was. You were supposed to build at least three deep
10 boreholes. You built one to 741 feet. I read the
11 Klinefelter (phonetics) report, and I read another
12 report that that was based on. And, frankly, your
13 supplemental EIS is an advertisement for such gross
14 deficiencies in your understanding of the seismic
15 situation up there, that this EIS ought to be a red
16 light to you, that we can't build this. This isn't
17 even worth considering this site as a location for
18 storing 13,200 pounds of plutonium, which is one of
19 the most explosive and dangerous substances on the
20 face of the planet.

21 You know, what are you thinking? You know,
22 is your mortgage so important to you that you are
23 willing to risk everything in the state on your
24 ignorance, your arrogance, your obstinacy?

25 You know, there were people in Fukushima,

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 they're elderly now. They're in their 80s, and they
2 said don't build, don't build this nuclear reactor
3 here. This is a dangerous site. We can have
4 tsunamis here, you know.

5 Now, you've got the public here, and
6 they're saying, don't build this thing here. This is
7 a dangerous site, you know. But you're not going to
8 listen to them. It's because of the arrogance of
9 power. Once you start making that kind of money you
10 feel like you can do anything. And you've got your
11 Joe Biden and the president on your side. So you've
12 got unlimited resources.

13 You know, that courtroom hearing that you
14 were out there, Roger, doesn't it -- there's a big
15 seal behind the judge, and it says, United States
16 District Court. It doesn't say, people's court of
17 the United States. And that's what the public is up
18 against. You know, the courts assume and give great
19 deference to the so-called experts of the government.
20 They're supposed to know.

21 So if the public walks in with an expert
22 and says, you know, that's wrong, the judge just
23 waves them aside.

24 Now you guys know in the federal government
25 that you've got that going for you. You know, you've

1 got money, you've got power, you've got the court
2 system on your side. So you can go ahead with the
3 most insane, stupid, idiotic location for building a
4 factory. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, you
5 ought to be ashamed of yourselves. (Applause.)

6 But more than that, you ought to
7 reconsider, you should just reconsider.

8 What Anastasio needs to do, and Mr. Snyder,
9 and the rest of you guys, that have all the power, is
10 you need to go back and tell the president,
11 Mr. President, you know what? It's too dangerous to
12 build this stuff here. You need to have a moment of
13 honesty. When you really state the truth, and you
14 start thinking about something, other than your
15 mortgage, you start thinking about the safety of the
16 public, the safety of the American public, and you
17 start giving the President and Mr. Biden some real
18 information, this site is too dangerous, folks, you
19 know. Stop pimping the President, stop pimping the
20 vice president for funds. (Applause.)

21 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: I just have
22 something very brief to say.

23 MR. MacALLISTER: Ma'am, in the blue, come
24 forward.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that is at the

1 last hearing that we had, we had -- there was a
2 professional facilitator, and he had a podium about
3 right there. And so the speaker -- though he was far
4 away from the speaker, the speaker could see him, and
5 he could say, well, you know, two minutes, three
6 minutes, one minute, and, you know, and the speaker
7 and the facilitator could speak to each other at
8 distance so that the speaker wasn't intimidated. I
9 just wanted to suggest that.

10 MR. MacALLISTER: Ma'am?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just have a
12 question to ask. I understood Don Hancock to say
13 that because the agreement, according to the rules
14 for holding this meeting, had not been met properly,
15 that 15 days has to be -- it has to be announced 15
16 days ahead of the meeting. And he said, if I'm
17 remembering correctly, that because of this, that you
18 need to go back and start from scratch, on this whole
19 issue, and go back to the regulations, follow the
20 regulations, and erase everything that went on that
21 was not according to those regulations, and start
22 from scratch with a whole new EIS, that you can't
23 start with what -- you can't carry on this continuing
24 process when what you have to do is start from
25 scratch.

1 So, are you going to go back and do a
2 different -- start with a new EIS and look at the
3 rules and abide by them, give 15 days' announcement
4 for the meeting, that's a public meeting, that will
5 be held, and start again with the beginning with the
6 EIS?

7 If Don is still around, if I left something
8 out or if I misunderstood what he said, I would like
9 to have that corrected, and get an answer from you.

10 MR. MacALLISTER: From me?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, yeah.

12 MR. MacALLISTER: I'm sorry, ma'am, but my
13 role is simply as a facilitator to see that everybody
14 makes -- has a chance to make comments.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, well, if you
16 could --

17 MR. MacALLISTER: I can't speak on behalf
18 of the Department, but...

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Well, who
20 here can speak on behalf of the department?

21 MR. MacALLISTER: I'm not sure that this is
22 going to be the venue where that can happen.

23 (Laughter from audience.) This is comments -- this
24 is designed to receive comments, not to discuss the
25 procedures.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you can't discuss
2 the procedures. (Laughing.) Well, I still want to
3 know what we have to do here, if we have to start all
4 over because you didn't give 15 days' notice, and
5 because the rest of the regulations were not carried
6 out that were part of the original agreement.

7 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: I can answer the
8 question for you to some extent.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

10 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: We did publish in the
11 Albuquerque Journal in advance of 15 days notice.

12 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Can you speak up?
13 We can't hear.

14 (Speakers from the floor were talking at
15 the same time and could not be reported.)

16 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Keep in mind the
17 transcript.

18 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: Number one, I will
19 look at the notice and I did -- we did publish notice
20 of this meeting in the Albuquerque Journal North on
21 Sunday, more than 15 days in advance of this meeting.
22 So that --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Sunday?

24 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: It was Sunday.

25 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: At Albuquerque

1 Journal North?

2 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: At North.

3 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: North?

4 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: And also in other
5 papers. So we issued the information -- we posted
6 the information on our NNSA Website well in advance
7 of 15 days, including the decision to add this
8 meeting, but I will go back and assure that, and look
9 up when that notice was made, and I do accept the
10 comment, and I will follow up on that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think we get
12 the Albuquerque Journal North in Albuquerque, I
13 think -- at least, I don't get it.

14 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: I will look into it,
15 yeah, but that's my recollection.

16 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: I don't think that
17 was the --

18 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: Comments, so --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But that's not
20 adequate anyway, the Albuquerque Journal is not an
21 adequate notice.

22 MR. JOHN TEGTMEIER: I will look into it.

23 MR. MacALLISTER: Comment's noted on the
24 record, so...

25 Are there other folks that would like to

1 make -- yes, sir, would you like to make a comment?

2 THE REPORTER: Could you get names? You're
3 not getting names.

4 MR. MacALLISTER: I'm sorry?

5 THE REPORTER: You're not getting the
6 names.

7 MR. MacALLISTER: And I'm being asked if
8 people are willing, to please provide their name
9 again for each comment so that our court reporter can
10 get that down for the record. But if you are --

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You want my name?
12 My name is (inaudible).

13 MR. MacALLISTER: And that was Floy Barrett
14 speaking.

15 MS. GREENWALD: And I'm Janet Greenwald. I
16 did say my name.

17 MR. MacALLISTER: I'm sorry.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I just have a
19 few additional comments to make, because there were a
20 lot of them, second-round comments that were very
21 good, I thought.

22 To me, this project looks like it's a make
23 work project for the nuclear industry. It's
24 something that if we're really going to be working
25 for peace, why are we working for war? You know, it

1 just seems incongruous to me. And I think some of
2 the -- I'm guessing at this, so it may not be totally
3 valid. But my assumption is that some of the higher
4 priced people that will be working on this project,
5 after the project is over with, will be able to run
6 home and not worry about any pollution that might
7 occur after the project ends, if any. Let's hope
8 not, okay?

9 But the record of sites that have nuclear
10 projects going on at them around this country has not
11 in the past been very good. So I'm just -- you know,
12 my lack of confidence, I guess, is showing here.

13 Another thing that was brought up, not in
14 this particular terminology, was the idea of mutual
15 assured destruction. It seems like maybe we're
16 headed in that direction, if we continue with
17 projects like this, where all we're doing, since we
18 hope never to use the products that we are building,
19 at this high price tag that we're going to be
20 building them at, if it happens, and I hope it
21 doesn't, but we are working toward war again. We
22 talk about peace, but it seems like the whole idea of
23 this project seems to be flying in the face of what
24 we talk about on the surface, our President talks
25 about peace -- or at least in other countries, maybe

1 not here, I don't know.

2 But I know, mutual assured destruction has
3 been normally referred to as mutual assured
4 destruction about -- in the past cold war era of the
5 Soviet Union had an old name, firing its missiles at
6 us, and us firing our missiles at them, and
7 essentially doing in the entire world.

8 Well, there's another way for mutual
9 assured destruction to occur, and that is, by
10 polluting the world. Fukushima served -- I forgot
11 the entire full name. But the Fukushima problem in
12 Japan that just occurred recently is a good example
13 of there's releases going into the air. I don't know
14 how well we are monitoring our conditions, the
15 changes here in the U.S., and in other parts of the
16 world, but I would imagine, readings have gone up
17 since Fukushima's problem had occurred. Apparently,
18 it's right now in meltdown, from what I understand.
19 But, anyway, even if it isn't --

20 We've also had releases that have gone into
21 the ocean. Who knows how long or how intense those
22 affects might be in the future?

23 And we are at a state now with nuclear or
24 nuclear industry, that any accident that happens,
25 does not just affect the place where the accident

1 happens. It has the potential for affecting the
2 entire planet. Forget about just the U.S., or
3 wherever an accident might happen. The results of
4 accidents by the nuclear industry can affect us all
5 around the entire world. And I don't think we should
6 accept it.

7 I'd love to see the nonnuclear nations get
8 together and say, look, we object to you guys having
9 these nuclear power plants, which is a peaceful use
10 of nuclear energy, because if another Fukushima type
11 accident happens, who knows as nuclear plants --
12 excuse me, as nuclear power plants continue to be
13 developed and produced, they may get bigger, so that
14 the potential is not only for Fukushima, but it could
15 be, maybe ten, a hundred thousand times the Fukushima
16 problem happening.

17 And, so I think we need to be real careful
18 about how we allow our nuclear industry to operate,
19 and I think that's part of the reason we're
20 questioning the DOE and other groups involved with
21 the nuclear industry. It's just essentially mutual
22 assured destruction in another form, in my mind. I
23 mean, missiles are a very bad thing, and I hope we
24 never have mutual assured destruction, called MAD.
25 It's a very good acronym to remember, it shows how

1 mad some of the ideas we have in this world are.

2 We could be using this money for increasing
3 alternative energy in this country, we could be using
4 it for many, many other things; education,
5 healthcare, lots of other things. These projects are
6 really mad.

7 I just want to end with a paraphrase, since
8 I don't remember the exact quote, but it was said by
9 one person who I think I'm attributing it to -- I
10 will attribute to them, but you can't work on peace
11 and war at the same time. And it's an old quote --
12 well, an old paraphrase, since I don't think I have
13 the words down here exactly. But you really can't
14 work on war and peace at the same time. And that was
15 a very wise -- well, I will say smart, maybe not
16 wise. I think it was wise also, probably, but that
17 was, I believe, attributed to Albert Einstein, who
18 had thought a lot about things like this, and, you
19 know, I think we need to end the madness.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

22 Is there anybody who hasn't made a second
23 comment that would like to comment? Sir? Would you
24 like to state your name?

25 MR. SCOTT WATSON: Yeah, my name is Scott

1 Watson. I would like to thank John for taking his
2 time to do this.

3 Wow, it's a very emotional issue, I think
4 for a lot of people, and I'm always impressed by
5 these public comments, sort of both sides of the
6 issue.

7 I guess I will stand in support of the CMRR
8 project. Having been a 45-year resident of
9 Los Alamos, I'm well aware of potential for hazard to
10 my house and my livelihood and my well-being, my
11 family, my friends, my relatives, my children.

12 The issues are serious, obviously, in the
13 sense that they take careful consideration, and
14 differing views will be presented here today.

15 I want to emphasize that my position is
16 based on the professionalism, the expertise, the
17 care, general respect for professionals like John and
18 others who deal with this work, who also have family,
19 children, et cetera, in close proximity to these
20 facilities.

21 I also lived near Rocky Flats. I spent two
22 tours in Iraq. I was on the BP oil spill effort.
23 I've seen what real disasters are, and I've seen what
24 Los Alamos is. And it is not a disaster site. It is
25 not an accident waiting to happen, or any of the

1 things that's been characterized here.

2 So, I just want to leave those comments for
3 those that are interested, perhaps a different
4 perspective. Thank you. (Applause.)

5 My name is Scott Watson.

6 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Do you work at the
7 Labs?

8 MR. SCOTT WATSON: Yes, sir.

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Is there anybody else who
10 hasn't already spoken or already made a second
11 comment, who would like to comment? If not, we have
12 time for other comments, and I believe, Mr. Hancock,
13 you had your hand up next.

14 MR. DON HANCOCK: Just an image that I
15 would like to leave people to think about, and I'd
16 like the Department of Energy to include it in its
17 further discussions. We've talked about numbers. I
18 would hope that most, if not everybody in this room
19 has been at the state capitol building in Santa Fe.
20 The size of the nuclear facility, as being proposed
21 in this document, is 50 percent larger than the state
22 capitol.

23 So, one can cause a lot of images in terms
24 of the importance of a shiny new bomb plant versus
25 the importance of the state government, and state

1 capitol. But think about whether -- and this is a
2 new building. It doesn't talk about the size of the
3 existing facilities of Los Alamos. This is just the
4 new building. What kind of statement that makes in
5 terms of what's important in the state of New Mexico
6 in terms of size and functions of buildings,
7 actual -- the state capitol and proposed nuclear
8 facility.

9 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir. You are
10 next. If there's nobody who plans to speak after our
11 next speaker, so I can cue you up, sir. You are
12 next. Ma'am, you're on cue now, and I'm just cuing
13 up the next person.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I was thinking
15 as I heard this talk, and I was thinking about the
16 magma. I don't think we've ever measured the exact
17 temperature of the magma at its depth. In other
18 words, we've never been to the center of the Earth.
19 And who was it who wrote, Journey to the Center of
20 the Earth? One of our authors. And, you know, maybe
21 if we dig deep enough, we can measure it. And, you
22 know, I look -- I look at everything in a positive
23 way. I try to make jelly out of berries, you know
24 what I mean, make it a good thing. And I just can't
25 really find -- because everything about the WIPP site

1 has been so negative.

2 When I started with Carlsbad, I tried to
3 save the animals in Carlsbad. The bats -- Phil
4 Ganyon (phonetics) has given up on the bats at
5 Carlsbad Caverns because some of the streams that are
6 supposed to be underneath the WIPP site have been
7 contaminated.

8 I'm sorry, but there is proof that some of
9 the nuclear energy from the WIPP site is going into
10 Carlsbad Caverns. And I don't like to hear things
11 like that. You know, what are we going to do? How
12 are we going to make this positive? I can't see
13 anything that can make this a positive thing. Why
14 not just take -- dig a deeper hole than we ever had
15 before, or is it to try to make the biggest bomb?
16 What is the purpose of it? What exactly are we
17 really trying to do? And, you know, Russia has a
18 bomb, so we build a bomb. And the Germans had the
19 first bombs, and, you know -- I mean, this goes on
20 and on and on. Why are we competing with our fellow
21 human beings to make the biggest bomb? That is what
22 I can't see.

23 And, I'm sorry, but I'm tired of talking to
24 the preacher. The preacher knows this. We all know
25 this.

1 My point is, how do we spread that
2 information? How do we make it into something that
3 we can really prevent? Because, you know, we can go
4 on in the meeting here, and talking about it, and
5 I've been to these meetings before, and they've never
6 done any good. So why do we have them? Why do we
7 have a U.S. Senate? Why do we have a government? If
8 we can't -- if people can't listen to our concerns
9 and prevent certain things that should not happen in
10 the first place? Why don't we talk about peace? Why
11 don't we make the biggest peace movement in the
12 country? Now that would be something. And then
13 spread it to Mexico, and spread it up to the
14 Norwegians. They are pretty good at peace. And make
15 it grow. I mean, people tried that years ago, but it
16 didn't work. But the bomb worked. And it's money,
17 it's money, and how to get it, and how to keep it.
18 And I'm so against that. I'm sorry, I sometimes get
19 kind of emotional.

20 MR. MacALLISTER: Sir, you are the next one
21 to speak.

22 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: You have to give
23 her your name.

24 Oh.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would just like,

1 to --

2 MR. MacALLISTER: Mention your name if --

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't really want
4 to.

5 MR. MacALLISTER: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The gentleman back
7 there that works at Los Alamos, Scott, I want to -- I
8 think it's good that you got up here and spoke. I
9 think it's -- it kind of -- it gives us an ability to
10 speak to the people that work for the DOE. And I'm
11 sure that you're a nice guy, you know, I'm sure that
12 if I was driving around Los Alamos, you probably
13 wouldn't cut me off in traffic, you know. But, I
14 happen to know some of the engineers that do sampling
15 in Cochiti Lake. And there is plutonium
16 contamination in the sediments in Cochiti Lake. And
17 I live down the stream from Cochiti. I live in the
18 South Valley, and we irrigate our water. We have a
19 well. And so that water comes from the Rio Grande.

20 So we're downstream from the pollution that
21 the people that work at the Department of Energy
22 create.

23 I mean, it's been shown that there are
24 radioactive materials in the Rio Grande River.

25 So, I don't understand, you know, how, if

1 you won't cut me off in traffic, it's okay for you to
2 make a living polluting our water and our air.

3 You know, we're real nice to each other on
4 some surface level, but at -- and the bottom line is,
5 we don't really give a (expletive deleted) about each
6 other, you know, we're going to do whatever we can to
7 make money, and buy nice cars, and have nice houses,
8 and just live the life of luxury. You don't care who
9 it hurts. What you do for a living hurts me. And I
10 don't like that. (Applause.)

11 MR. SCOTT WATSON: If I may rebut the
12 comments made about what I do for a living.

13 MR. MacALLISTER: Would you like to come to
14 the --

15 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Isn't this a
16 conflict of interest?

17 MR. SCOTT WATSON: I have heard a lot of
18 discussion this evening about mutual respect or at
19 least respect. With all due respect to you, sir, you
20 have no idea what I do for a living. Okay? You have
21 no idea what motivates me. You have no idea what
22 motivates my neighbors. You have no idea what
23 motivates my father. You have no idea. And for you
24 to make such a comment is pretty far out there.
25 That's really what I have to say about it.

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you, sir.

2 Are there any further comments relevant to
3 the meeting topic on the environmental impact
4 statement?

5 Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for
6 your participation. We will be available until 9:00
7 if there were other comments. I appreciate your
8 courtesy and your civility. Thank you.

9 (There were no more speakers until close to
10 9:00.)

11 MR. MacALLISTER: May I have your
12 attention, please? We have Leona Morgan, who would
13 like to make a comment.

14 MS. LEONA MORGAN: Hi. Thank you for your
15 time and for hearing me at the very last minute of
16 the hearing tonight. My name is Leona Morgan. I'm
17 Dineh, from the Navajo Nation, and the majority of my
18 family are in the Crownpoint area.

19 Crownpoint, New Mexico, is one of the
20 communities in eastern Navajo which has been plagued
21 with a lot of contamination from the uranium mining
22 that had gone on during the mid 20th century which
23 contributed to the World War II manufacturing of all
24 those weapons of mass instruction.

25 Right now one of the issues we're really

1 concerned about is not only the building of a new
2 plutonium pit factory and using a lot of money from
3 the United States Government to continue these acts
4 of war. We're also worried about the push for
5 nuclear power because that uranium that supplies the
6 nuclear power plants comes from our area, and a lot
7 of the Navajo communities who have been working
8 against new uranium mining are also dealing with a
9 lot of contamination from past mining. And there's
10 one site in Church Rock which is a Superfund site,
11 and as I understand, the estimated costs for cleaning
12 up just one area goes into the hundreds -- you know,
13 over \$100 million for one little area. And that's
14 not to count all of the abandoned uranium mines all
15 over Navajo Nation in New Mexico and in Arizona. So
16 the cost to clean up these contaminated areas is
17 overwhelming.

18 So I have to just say that I as an
19 individual am against this new LANL building which
20 would also cause a lot more contamination. And if
21 the United States is going to spend billions of
22 dollars, why don't they look at spending it on
23 something which would help out our communities by
24 cleaning up the mess that was left from the last
25 century, so our generation, myself and the people who

1 have not even been born yet -- we're going to inherit
2 this problem that was created by people we've never
3 even met who will not be alive to deal with the
4 radiation that we're going to have to live with. And
5 we know that you can't clean up radiation, once the
6 water is contaminated, once the earth is
7 contaminated, the animals, our food sources, the
8 plants, everything is going to cost not only the
9 lives and the ecological systems, you know. It's
10 going to cause them all to be affected, but it's also
11 going to cost human life, a lot of human lives. And
12 when we're talking about cost of a human life you
13 can't really put a price on that.

14 So being indigenous, like I said, I'm
15 Navajo, I'm Dineh, and I'm sorry, I should have
16 introduced myself. (In Navajo.) And so speaking
17 from the indigenous perspective, when we lose human
18 life, we also lose our cultural ways, and so whenever
19 we talk about contaminating the earth more, I'm from
20 Navajo and I'm dealing, you know, with the uranium
21 mining. But I know tomorrow night you guys will be
22 in Los Alamos and you'll probably hear from several
23 of the pueblos and those constituents.

24 So I just want to leave you with a story
25 that I heard last summer from some of the native

1 people that live around the Los Alamos National Labs.
2 They, as a sovereign nation, have gone into an
3 agreement with the United States back when this area
4 was first being constructed that is it their
5 patriotic duty to allow the U.S. Government to come
6 in and use their land and their resources to build
7 this plant to "win the war."

8 So I understand the agreement was that
9 after the war was won, that the U.S. Government would
10 then leave. And so there are plenty of people out
11 there who are waiting for this to happen, and so this
12 agreement has not been forgotten. And so I know a
13 lot of the people who you will speak with tomorrow
14 are going to speak to this. And that is, like the
15 uranium mining, an example of environmental racism.
16 So I would just like you all to know that these
17 issues need to be consulted with on a
18 government-to-government basis and so I think that's
19 one thing that needs to be done. It's not only to
20 have public hearings in Albuquerque like this, but I
21 think you also need to have public hearings in each
22 of the pueblos and all of the native communities
23 downwind from this project.

24 And that's all I would like to say, so
25 thank you. Thank you for your time.

1 MR. MacALLISTER: Thank you very much.
2 Again, we will be available until 9:00 to take any
3 statements that people want to make.

4 (The hearing adjourned at 9:02 p.m.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ss.

2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3
4 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

5 I, BEVERLY ANN SCHLEIMER, New Mexico Certified
6 Court Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that I did report
7 in stenographic shorthand the proceedings set forth
8 herein, and the foregoing is a true and correct
9 transcript of the proceedings.

10 In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my
11 hand on this 30th day of May, 2011.

12
13
14
15 _____
Beverly Ann Schleimer, RDR
16 BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
Certified Court Reporter NM CCR #66
17 License Expires: 12/31/2011

18 _____
Mary Abernathy Seal, RDR
19 BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
Certified Court Reporter NM CCR #69
20 License Expires: 12/31/2011

21
22
23
24
25
SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 820-6349

**BEAN
& ASSOCIATES, Inc.**
PROFESSIONAL COURT
REPORTING SERVICE

MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com